

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

SEP 26 1927

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.A., Hon. Treasurer.

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. B. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.A. } With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.  
D. S. ROBERTSON M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. Wm. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

SEP 26 1927

Vol. XLI

SEPTEMBER, 1927

No. 4

## CONTENTS

	PAGE	REVIEWS (continued):	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	113	<i>Irony</i> (Thomson); <i>Leaves of Hellas</i> (MacGregor). G. A. DAVIES .. ..	129
PRASIAI OR PHALERON? G. M. and M. E. HIRST .. .. .	113	<i>Geschichte der griechischen Literatur</i> (Aly). T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS .. ..	130
THE DURATION OF A TRIERARCHY. D. S. ROBERTSON .. .. .	114	<i>The Political Ideas of the Greeks</i> (Myres). W. R. HALLIDAY .. ..	131
FOUR PASSAGES IN DEMOSTHENES' <i>De Chersoneso</i> . M. MACGREGOR .. ..	116	<i>Autour de Platon</i> (Diès). A. E. TAYLOR .. ..	132
AN EPIGRAPHIC CONTRIBUTION TO LETTERS. W. H. BUCKLER .. .. .	119	<i>Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Politik</i> (von Arnim). E. S. FORSTER .. ..	134
NOTE ON TACITUS' SUMMARY OF THE REIGN OF AUGUSTUS. L. E. LORD .. ..	121	<i>Epicurus: The Extant Remains</i> (Bailey). J. L. STOCKS .. ..	135
DEFRUTUM. T. J. HAARHOFF .. .. .	122	<i>History of the Sciences in Greco-Roman Antiquity</i> (Reymond). SIR T. L. HEATH .. ..	137
ELIDED SPONDEES IN THE SECOND AND THIRD FOOT OF THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER. S. K. JOHNSON .. .. .	123	<i>Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung</i> (Mahlow). R. MCKENZIE .. ..	138
HORACE, <i>Odes</i> I. 14. H. RACKHAM .. ..	124	<i>Primitive Culture in Italy</i> (Rose). D. RANDALL-MACIVER .. ..	139
TACITUS, <i>Histories</i> , II. 86. H. HILL .. ..	124	<i>Lucrèce: De Rerum Natura</i> (Ernout et Robin). C. BAILEY .. ..	140
PLUTARCH, <i>Lucullus</i> , c. 20. H. W. GREENE .. ..	124	<i>Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit II.</i> (Dessau). J. G. C. ANDERSON .. ..	142
A VIRGILIAN REMINISCENCE IN APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS. W. B. ANDERSON .. ..	124	<i>Three Books on Syntax</i> . H. WILLIAMSON .. ..	143
REVIEWS:		SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	146-155
<i>Die Religion der Griechen</i> (Kern). H. J. ROSE .. ..	125	OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY .. ..	155
<i>Olympia, its History and Remains</i> (Gardiner). A. J. B. WACE .. .. .	126	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. ..	155
<i>The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer</i> (Bolling). J. T. SHEPPARD .. ..	127	CORRESPONDENCE .. .. .	157
		BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	158

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. S. K. Johnson, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Caius College, Cambridge.

### BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND  
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD  
LONDON, W.C. 2.

MURRAY'S

## Classical Atlas

FOR SCHOOLS

Edited by G. B. GRUNDY  
M.A., D.Litt.

Consisting of 14 Sheets (containing 83  
Maps and Plans). Folio ( $14\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{3}{4}$  ins.).  
Second Edition. Price 9s. net.

SECOND IMPRESSION

## CLASSICAL STUDIES

By J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D.

*Contents:* THE PLACE OF GREEK AND LATIN IN HUMAN LIFE—THE REPORT OF THE PRIME MINISTER'S COMMITTEE ON THE CLASSICS IN EDUCATION—WHAT IS THE GOOD OF GREEK?—PENELOPE IN THE "ODYSSEY"—THE ALLIANCE OF LATIN AND ENGLISH STUDIES—VIRGIL'S ITALY—THE VIRGILIAN UNDERWORLD—THE "ODES" OF HORACE—THE LAST GREAT ROMAN HISTORIAN—THE CLASSICS—THE PLACE OF THE CLASSICS IN IMPERIAL STUDIES—PATRIOTISM. 7s. 6d. net.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

e  
y  
e  
r  
,  
y  
;  
y  
il  
s  
y,  
s.  
.  
r.  
t,  
r,  
d

S

83  
s.).

THE  
D OF  
DIES  
LAST  
ERIAL  
net.  
V. I

ha  
ta  
At  
Co  
Di  
As  
re  
ga  
wi  
de  
G  
T  
th  
ev  
sc  
be  
ph  
to  
va  
A  
ti

w  
A  
So  
H

M  
th  
(p  
E  
an  
sl  
th  
re  
sa  
re  
sa  
is  
si  
h  
m  
m  
d

b

# The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1927

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Classical Association of Victoria has been exerting itself to get Greek taught in the State secondary schools. At the last meeting of the Victorian Council of Education, on the motion of Dr. Leeper, President of the Classical Association, a resolution was carried requesting the Director of Education to gazette the names of high schools in which boys and girls whose parents desired it might obtain instruction in Greek before entering the University. This concession has now been made by the Department, with the proviso, however, that at least five pupils in any school must apply for such teaching before a class can be formed. The philhellenes fear that the number five is too high for the concession to be valuable, and it is understood that the Association will agitate for the reduction of the number to three.

Members of the Classical Association will be interested to hear that a Classical Association has just been founded in South Africa. Its first President is the Hon. J. H. Hofmeyer, and its Secretaries

are Miss Williams of Johannesburg and Dr. Rollo of Capetown. Among the resolutions carried unanimously at the opening meeting was one 'to seek immediate affiliation with the Classical Association of England.' This means, we hope, that in due course we shall find news of the activities of our South African friends in the Appendix to the *Proceedings of the Classical Association*. We offer the new Association our hearty good wishes.

### JAMES LOEB SEXAGENARIO.

Post quinquaginta complere decem dedit annos  
Cultori faultrix diva Minerva suo:  
Aetatem vegetam producat prospera promens  
Illi, qui rebus favit adestque suis.

THE *Classical Review* has been asked on behalf of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* to publish the above verses in the hope, which we share, that 'gaudio fortasse erit viro venerabili in celeberrimis illis chartis recognoscere, quae nos ei scripsimus modeste et verecunde.' We, too, rejoice that Mr. Loeb lives and thrives, and that his services to scholarship have found a German poet.

### PRASIAI OR PHALERON?

IN *Athens, its History and Coinage* Mr. Seltman, arguing that Prasiai was the ancient harbour of Athens, adds (p. 12): 'It seems clear that the Sacred Embassy or *Theoria* which went annually from Athens to Delos by the ship which, according to belief, was the very one in which Theseus had returned triumphant from Knossos, set sail from Prasiai.' This conclusion rests mainly upon a passage of Pausanias (I. 31. 2) which states that there is a monument at Prasiai to Ery-sichthon 'who died on the voyage home from Delos, after the sacred mission thither.' But in his commentary Sir James Frazer expressly dismisses the inference as 'not proved.'

It is, as Mr. Seltman says, accepted by Roscher, and by Pfuhl (*De Athenien-*

*sium Pompis Sacris*), and also by Preller,<sup>1</sup> but the evidence they adduce for a joint *Theoria* of the Athenians and the Marathonian Tetrapolis, sailing from Prasiai, does not seem to point to more than a legendary connexion between Prasiai and Delos, and a *Theoria* sent by the Tetrapolis.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, there seems no very evident ground for connecting the sacrifices at Marathon described in the scholium on Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1047 (in an express quotation from *Φιλόχορος ἐν τῇ Τετραπόλει γράφων*) with anything but a *Theoria* from the Tetrapolis to Delos, and it is surely an assumption that the *Theoria* from Athens was identical with this.

<sup>1</sup> *Griech. Myth.* II. 138<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. J. Toepffer, *Die Attischen Pythiasten und Deliasen* in *Hermes* xxiii.

Greek tradition apparently associated Phaleron with Theseus' voyage—e.g., Pausanias I. 1. 2 Φαληρόν δέ—ταύτη γὰρ ἐλάχιστον ἀπέχει τῆς πόλεως ἢ θάλασσα—, τοῦτό σφισιν [i.e., τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις] ἐπίνειον ἦν, καὶ Μενεσθέα φασὶν αὐτόθεν ταῖς ναυσὶν εἰς Τροίαν ἀναχθῆναι καὶ τοῦτον πρότερον Θησέα δώσοντα Μίνω δίκας τῆς Ἀνδρόγεω τελευτῆς. Plutarch (*Theseus*, c. 23) says he landed there on his return. His helmsman and look-out man had shrines or chapels at Phaleron,<sup>1</sup> which implies that Theseus' ship was not associated with Prasiai, and, as already remarked, the Theoric ship was believed to be that famous vessel, constantly renewed yet always the same—a standing puzzle to philosophers.<sup>2</sup> There was also at Phaleron a shrine of the Delian Apollo.<sup>3</sup>

But our main knowledge of the Athenian Theoria in the fifth century is derived from the accounts of Socrates' imprisonment and death. None of these give any hint that Prasiai was the port. Xenophon (*Mem.* IV. 8. 2)

merely says that the execution was delayed ἕως ἂν ἡ θεωρία ἐκ Δήλου ἐπανέλθῃ. In the *Crito* (43c-d) the whole phraseology implies that the ship is coming to a usual port—e.g., οὗτοι δὲ ἀφίκεται, ἀλλὰ δοκεῖν μὲν μοι ἤξει τήμερον ἐξ ὧν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν ἡκοντές τινες ἀπὸ Σουνίου καὶ καταλιπόντες ἐκεῖ αὐτό.<sup>4</sup> In the *Phaedo* (58a-c) Phaedo gives an elaborate account of the origin and conduct of the Theoria to the Peloponnesian Echecrates, who seems to have no previous knowledge of it—τοῦτο δὲ δὴ τί ἐστίν; There is no mention of Prasiai, but a strong suggestion of a port close to Athens—πρὶν ἂν εἰς Δήλὸν τε ἀφίκηται τὸ πλοῖον καὶ πάλιν δεῦρο (58b)—not of course to the scene of the dialogue but to Athens, the place in the speaker's thoughts. So when the friends leave Socrates' prison the evening before his death they hear ὅτι τὸ πλοῖον ἐκ Δήλου ἀφικνέμενον εἴη.

G. M. HIRST.

M. E. HIRST.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, *Theseus*, c. 17. Roscher, *Lex.* V. 693 s.v. Theseus. In this article Phaleron is taken as Theseus' landing-place, though I. 1388 s.v. Erysichthon gives the Prasiai view.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, *Theseus*, c. 23, and Plato, *Phaedo* 58a-b.

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.A.* I. 210.

<sup>4</sup> The passage is thus taken by Professor Burnet, *Euthyphro*, *Apology*, *Crito*, p. 174: 'It will probably make the Piræus by the next day.' (? Phaleron.) A land journey from Sunium would save little time if the port were Prasiai.

### THE DURATION OF A TRIERARCHY.

It was asserted by Boeckh,<sup>1</sup> on the authority of [Demosthenes] *Adv. Polyclem* (50) 11 and Isocrates *Adv. Callimachum* (18) 59, that the return of a trireme to Piræus at any time, or the failure of the general to provide pay for its crew, automatically brought its commander's trierarchy to an end. Boeckh regarded this as a definite law. The assertion has been copied in books of reference (e.g., Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* and Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, s.v. *Trierarchia* in each case), and it still holds the field. H. Fränkel, for instance, repeats it with confidence in his discussion of a naval inscription in *Ath. Mitt.* XLVIII, 1923, p. 17, though he finds it difficult to reconcile with the inscrip-

tion. Kolbe,<sup>2</sup> indeed, in a dissertation which I have not seen, is said to have questioned the existence of an actual law; but I gather that he accepted Boeckh's general interpretation.

The improbability of a law or custom so unfavourable to the state needs no demonstration, and it is difficult to understand how anyone who had read the Polycles speech could believe in its existence. It is there plainly stated (c. 67) that, even after the expiration of his full year's service, any trierarch whose successor had not yet arrived would be regarded as guilty of an offence

<sup>2</sup> *De Ath. re navali quaest. sol.* Brillant (in Daremberg and Saglio), to whom I owe the reference, says: 'Kolbe ne croit pas qu'il s'agisse d'une loi véritable; en tout cas le texte est formel.'

<sup>1</sup> *Staatsverwaltung*<sup>3</sup>, I., p. 630.

if he refused to obey the general's orders to serve overtime for an indefinite period. The speaker, in fact, served for five months and six days beyond his year (c. 1). In truth, Boeckh's view rests upon a simple mistranslation of one phrase in that speech: the passage of Isocrates, which he merely added by way of confirmation, deals, as I shall show, with extraordinary circumstances, and justifies no such generalisation.

The Demosthenic passage (50, 11) runs as follows: *τριήρους γὰρ ὁμολογεῖται κατάλυσις εἶναι, πρῶτον μὲν ἂν μὴ μισθὸν τις διδῶ, δεύτερον δὲ ἂν εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ μεταξὺ καταπλεύσῃ ἀπόλειψις τε γὰρ πλείστη γίγνεται, οἱ τε παραμένοντες τῶν ναυτῶν οὐκ ἐθέλουσι πάλιν ἐμβαίνειν, ἂν μὴ τις αὐτοῖς ἕτερον ἀργύριον διδῶ, ὥστε τὰ οἰκεία διοικήσασθαι. ἃ ἐμοὶ ἀμφότερα συνέβη, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὥστε πολυτελεστέραν μοι γενέσθαι τὴν τριηραρχίαν.*

It is obvious that, had the supposed rule existed, most trierarchs would have jumped at the chance of returning to Piraeus; but Apollodorus, the speaker, is at pains to show that such an incident greatly increased the trierarch's expenses. Boeckh rendered *τριήρους κατάλυσις* 'Auflösung der Trierarchie,' but this translation is indefensible. It cannot be supposed that he confused *τριήρης* and *τριηραρχία*, and it is unlikely that he thought that *κατάλυσις* could be used of the normal termination of an official duty. This is a sense which *καταλύω* and *κατάλυσις* never seem to bear; there is no instance in Thucydides, Plato, Demosthenes, Aeschines, or in the inscriptions published in the third edition of Dittenberger's *Sylloge*. Boeckh probably took *τριήρους κατάλυσις* to mean literally, as in some contexts it might, 'the disbanding of a trireme's crew' by the order of its trierarch. But this sense could scarcely be extended here to imply 'the right of a trierarch to disband his crew and to regard his duties as terminated.'

The commonest meaning of *καταλύω* and *κατάλυσις*, apart from obviously irrelevant idioms, is the irregular and abnormal dissolution, destruction, or abandonment of some established organisation or activity, and this is surely the sense in the passage under

discussion. The best literary parallel that I have found is Demosthenes 18, 102: *ὁρῶν τὸ ναυτικὸν ὑμῶν καταλυόμενον*. In two other instances, [Demosthenes] 49, 13, *ἄμισθον μὲν τὸ στράτευμα καταλελύσθαι ἐν Καλανρείᾳ*, and *ibid.* 14, where Timotheus is said to have borrowed 1,000 drachmae to distribute to the Boeotian trierarchs, lest he should incur the wrath of the Athenians *καταλυθεῖσών πρότερον τῶν τριήρων καὶ διαπελθόντων πρότερον τῶν στρατιωτῶν*, the meaning may be actual disbanding of the troops and crews, though in each case such disbanding or dissolution is premature and abnormal and due to lack of pay. There is a better parallel in an Attic decree almost exactly contemporary with the Polycles speech (*I.G.* II.<sup>2</sup> 123 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 192), in which various measures are prescribed *ὅπως ἂν ἔχωσιν οἱ φρουροὶ οἱ ἐν Ἀνδρῶ μισθὸν . . . καὶ μὴ καταλήται ἡ φυλακή*. In the Polycles passage the meaning of *τριήρους κατάλυσις* must be, as the Paris *Thesaurus* and Liddell and Scott say, 'the ruin of a trireme' by the dispersal of her crew. 'Two things,' says Apollodorus, 'admittedly play havoc with a trireme—failure of pay and touching at Piraeus before the year is up.' It is true that Apollodorus was thanked by the Ecclesia and feasted at the Prytaneum when he put to sea again (c. 13); but he makes it clear that this was because he had spent his own money freely, and had got a crew together with exceptional promptitude. He was already under orders from the Ecclesia to take a new general to the Hellespont (c. 12). He always speaks of the expiration of his trierarchy—one year's service (cc. 1, 10)—as a matter of *time* alone (e.g. c. 14, *ὅ τε χρόνος ἐξεληλύθει μοι τῆς τριηραρχίας*; so cc. 15, 67, etc.), and never hints that his responsibilities ceased when he entered Piraeus, probably at a date at least two months<sup>1</sup> before the end of his year.

In Isocrates 18, 59 ff. the speaker is

<sup>1</sup> This is almost certain from the comparison of cc. 10 and 12: he only received two months' pay for his men in his whole seventeen months of service, and when he entered Piraeus it was eight months since he had received any. He got the two months' pay during his proper year (c. 14), probably at the beginning.

boasting of his unique loyalty after Aegospotami: *ὅτε γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἀπώλεσε τὰς ναῦς τὰς ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐστερήθη, τῶν μὲν πλείστων τριηραρχῶν τοσοῦτον διήνεγκον ὅτι μετ' ὀλίγων ἔσωσα τὴν ναῦν, αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων ὅτι καταπλεύσας εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ μόνος οὐ κατέλυσα τὴν τριηραρχίαν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀσμένως ἀπαλλαττομένων τῶν λητουργιῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰ παρόντ' ἀθύμως διακειμένων, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀνηλωμένων αὐτοῖς μεταμέλον, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ἀποκρυπτομένων, καὶ νομιζόντων τὰ μὲν κοινὰ διεφθάρθαι, τὰ δ' ἴδια σκοποῦμένων, οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις γνώμην ἔσχον, ἀλλὰ*

*πέισας τὸν ἀδελφὸν συντριηραρχεῖν παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν μισθὸν διδόντες τοῖς ναύταις κακῶς ἐποιούμεν τοὺς πολεμούς.* Clearly, the other trierarchs took advantage of the general panic and despair to drop their legal obligations. It would be absurd to infer from this passage the existence in normal times of such a rule as Boeckh laid down. For the phrase *οὐ κατέλυσα τὴν τριηραρχίαν* Plato (*Laws* 762 c) furnishes a good parallel: a guard who absents himself without leave or excuse has his name posted in the agora as *καταλεικνόμενος τὴν φρουράν*.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

#### FOUR PASSAGES IN DEMOSTHENES' *DE CHERSONESO*.

(a) § 75. *οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ περὶ ὧν ἂν ἐγὼ λέγω καὶ περὶ ὧν ἂν ὁ δεῖν' εἴπῃ, τὰ μὲν ἔργα παρ' ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἵκηται, τὰ δὲ βέλτιστα ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν παρὰ τοῦ παριόντος.*

THIS is the reading of the MSS., with the exception of the Paris Sosandrian (S) and a later Florentine MS., which omit *καὶ περὶ ὧν ἂν ὁ δεῖν' εἴπῃ*, a point which does not materially affect the words to be considered.

Mr. H. Richards, in *Classical Review*, Vol. XXIX., p. 101, cited Plato, *Ion* 532c (*τέχνην καὶ ἐπιστήμην περὶ Ὅμηρου λέγειν ἀδύνατος εἶ*), for the use of *ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν*. The *Ion* discusses the question whether the critic of Homer—Ion was a professional reciter and panegyrist of Homer—speaks with art and knowledge, *i.e.* scientifically, basing his remarks on the principles of a craft, or enthusiastically, *i.e.* stimulated to express opinions by the effect produced upon him by the genius of Homer's poems. Thus in 536c Plato writes: *οὐ γὰρ τέχνην οὐδ' ἐπιστήμην περὶ Ὅμηρου λέγεις ἂν λέγεις, ἀλλὰ θεῖα μοῖρα καὶ κατοκωχή.*

If, then, we are to apply the parallel here, it would make Demosthenes suggest that a speaker in the Assembly should be required to expound the best policy scientifically, *i.e.* basing his views on the principles of the craft of politics.

But this is certainly not Demosthenes' view. He explicitly recognises that, in any set of circumstances, a man may be inspired, under their influence, to make on the spur of the moment a happy suggestion for dealing with them.

He recognises, that is to say, that in public speaking there is room for the 'enthusiastic' no less than for the 'scientific' adviser. Cf. *Ol. I. 1*: *οὐ γὰρ μόνον εἴ τι χρησίμων ἐσκεμμένος ἦκει τις, τοῦτ' ἂν ἀκούσαντες λάβοιτε, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας τύχης ὑπολαμβάνω πολλὰ τῶν δόντων ἐκ τοῦ παραχρήμ' ἐνίοις ἂν ἐπελθεῖν εἴπειν, ὥστ' ἐξ ἀπάντων ῥαδίαν τὴν τοῦ συμφέροντος ὑμῖν αἵρεσιν γενέσθαι.* The same point occurs in *de Pace* 11.

Apart from this—to me decisive—consideration, a parallel from a specialised context in Plato seems hardly a reliable guide for the language of Demosthenes in a popular harangue. Mr. Richards also cited Plato, *Rep.* 422c; but as he himself added (justly) that it 'is not quite parallel,' it is perhaps unnecessary to discuss it. The conjecture *ἐπιστάμενον*, which was impartially added to the defence by parallel of *ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν*, is open to the same objection as that phrase, and further appears to possess on palaeographical grounds but little probability.

It is, indeed, generally agreed that *ἐπιστήμῃ λέγειν* is neither a Demosthenic phrase nor apposite here.

The proposal of Blass—*ἂν δὲ βέλτιστ' ἢ μή*—offers on a favourable estimate but a feeble sense. To excise *λέγειν*, as Blass did, removes the effective counter to *ἔργα*.

Sandys, in proposing *ἂν δὲ βέλτιστ' ἐνεστί λέγειν*, justly retained the infinitive. But, palaeographically, the reading is one hardly likely to be converted

into the tradition of the MSS., and it does not provide a satisfactory sense.

I suggest that the words of Demosthenes were ἀ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν λέγειν, and that the corruption arose from a combination of two causes: (i.) Parablepsy, which led the scribe, after writing the ε of ἐστὶν, to continue with τι, which preceded στ in the word before—to wit, βέλτιστ'; (ii.) the confusion in minuscule writing of ω with η. Together with haplography of the confused symbols, these causes produced βέλτιστ' ἐπιστήμη, whence ἐπιστήμη was derived.

The meaning of the passage, as I understand it, is not that a man addressing the Assembly should be required to tender the *absolutely* best advice, or the best advice *possible*. That would be an altogether unfair and extravagant demand, and it would, indeed, suggest that only one policy would be proposed, and so rule out debate. It is for that reason that Sandys' ἀ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἐνεστί λέγειν fails to commend itself. We need a qualification, and just such a one would be supplied by ἀ δὲ βέλτιστ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν λέγειν, 'the best that we have.' ἡμῖν refers to *us speakers*, indicated earlier in the sentence by ἐγὼ and ὁ δεινός. Thus the suggestion of the passage accords with the manner of procedure in the Assembly that Demosthenes elsewhere approves as the right one. Cf. *Ol.* III. 18: καὶ νῦν οὐ λέγει τις τὰ βέλτιστα· ἀναστὰς ἄλλος εἰπάτω, μὴ τοῦτον αἰτιάσθω. ἕτερος λέγει τις βελτίω· ταῦτα ποιεῖτ' ἀγαθὴ τύχη.

(b) § 67. οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον περὶ θ' ὑμῶν καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐνίοις τῶν λεγόντων ὁρῶ βουλευομένους· ὑμᾶς μὲν γὰρ ἡσυχίαν ἀγειν φασὶ δειν, κἄν τις ὑμᾶς ἀδικῇ, αὐτοὶ δ' οὐ δύνανται παρ' ὑμῶν ἡσυχίαν ἀγειν, οὐδενὸς αὐτοὺς ἀδικοῦντος.

This passage is usually printed as continuous with that preceding it, a new division of the speech being indicated as beginning with the immediately succeeding paragraph, εἰτα φησὶν ὅς ἂν τύχη παρελθὼν κ.τ.λ.

But these words have no logical connexion with the preceding argument, which consists of an attack upon the pro-Macedonian opponents of Demosthenes, whose policy means their city's disgrace and poverty, but their own distinction and wealth; for Philip prosperity, power, and universal awe, but

for Athens isolation, insignificance, and, as far as warlike resources go, contempt. What Demosthenes adds in οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον κ.τ.λ. is no development of this theme.

Recognising this, Weil proposed to associate the words with the passage that succeeds. 'La suite du morceau,' he wrote, 'explique assez cette locution. εἰτα "puis" ne marque pas seulement un rapport de temps, mais un rapport de causalité. . . . Il est naturel, dit Démosthène, que les effrontés traitent ma modération de timidité et de mollesse. Cette liaison des idées est moins claire dans les éditions où la période οὐ . . . ἀδικοῦντος se trouve rapportée à l'alinéa précédent.'

I find a difficulty, and I think others will find one, in agreeing with Weil that εἰτα at the opening of § 68 marks a causal connexion. It seems to me to be employed, as Demosthenes normally employs it, to introduce us to a new point, important *per se*, rather than to a result flowing from what has gone before (cf. e.g. its use in § 35 of this speech). But, altogether apart from this, Weil's association of οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον κ.τ.λ. with what follows leaves still unresolved the difficulty, which he justly feels, of the connexion of these words with the passage preceding them.

I suggest that these words are *an aside*, and I think this should be made clear in the printing of the text of the speech. We are too apt to forget that Demosthenes' orations were delivered to an audience, and were, in consequence, subject to interruption from those whom they handled roughly and their supporters. The *de Chersoneso* is eminently a fighting speech. Demosthenes' opponents were clearly present in full force. His attack upon them, their pro-Macedonian policy and its results, would evoke vigorous protests, and the words οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον κ.τ.λ. represent his retort. In § 68, εἰτα φησὶν ὅς ἂν τύχη παρελθὼν κ.τ.λ., he resumes the thread of his discourse.

(c) § 59. ἐκείνος γὰρ οὐ πολεμεῖν (sc. φήσει) ὥσπερ οὐδ' Ἀρεΐταις, τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὄντων ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ, οὐδὲ Φεραίους πρότερον πρὸς τὰ τέλην προσβάλλων αὐτῶν, οὐδ' Ὀλυνθίους ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἔως ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ χώρᾳ τὸ στράτευμα παρῆν ἔχων. ἢ καὶ τότε τοὺς ἀμύνεσθαι κελεύοντας πόλεμον ποιεῖν φήσομεν; οὐκοῦν ὑπόλοιπον δουλεύειν· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο γ' οὐδὲν ἐστί μεταξὺ τοῦ μὴτ' ἀμύνεσθαι μὴτ' ἀγειν ἡσυχίαν εἶσθαι.

Editors and translators alike make the two extremes, between which there is nothing else, τὸ μὴ ἀμύνεσθαι on the one hand, and τὸ μὴ ἄγειν ἡσυχίαν ἔασθαι on the other. For example, Mr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, the Oxford translator, writes (p. 181): 'Slavery seems to be ironically regarded as a compromise between activity and acquiescence'; while the late Sir John Sandys' note runs: 'If, on the one hand, Philip's partisans will not allow us to resist him, and, on the other, Philip himself will not let us alone, the only course open to us is to submit to him as slaves.'

Is this sound? It seems to me that the single article τοῦ and the close-coupling μήτε . . . μήτε are, apart from consideration of sense, sufficient to prevent any suggestion of contrast or opposition between activity and quiescence, or, again, non-resistance and external interference.

In Greek one takes one's bearings 'from' a place—i.e. by the use of the Ablative, which has been merged with the Genitive, Case. Thus it has become usual to say that in Greek words indicative of position 'take' the Genitive. The word μεταξύ, 'in the middle,' necessarily involves *everywhere* two points from which bearings are taken. There cannot, of course, be 'a middle' where there is only *one* side; but in colloquial Greek—in Aristophanes, for example—where one point, in reference to which a 'middle' exists, is *clearly* indicated in the context, the second, defining bearing-point relative to the one already implied, may later alone be explicitly named. The other, it is assumed, is already present to the consciousness of the listener.

Thus in Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 433-4,

κέῖται δ' ἄνωθεν τῶν Θουσετείων ῥακῶν,  
μεταξύ τῶν Ἰνοῦς,

'the *Thyestean rags*' are already indicated in 433 as on *one* side; it is therefore needless to repeat the phrase, and only the *other* side, 'the rags of Ino,' is added with μεταξύ. Similarly in Aristophanes, *Birds* 187,

ἐν μέσῳ δῆπουθεν ἀήρ ἐστι γῆς,

the *one* side, τοὺς θεοὺς, is patent in the context (l. 186); therefore it is only necessary to mention the *other*—viz γῆς.

Demosthenes' prose is highly polished. But it is not artificial. It employs the idiom of established Athenian speech. It has done so here, though this, I think, has hitherto remained unrecognised.

The *one* side δουλεύειν is indicated clearly in the context. It corresponds to τῶν Θουσετείων ῥακῶν and τοὺς θεοὺς in the passages from the *Acharnians* and the *Birds*. The *other* side (not, as it has been interpreted, the *two* sides) is τοῦ μήτ' ἀμύνεσθαι μήτ' ἄγειν ἡσυχίαν ἔασθαι. What Demosthenes says is that there is no *third* thing (ἄλλο) in between them. Or, to put it another way, they are but different sides of the *same* thing, like the obverse and reverse of a coin. τὸ μήτ' ἀμύνεσθαι μήτ' ἄγειν ἡσυχίαν ἔασθαι is *seven* words for what τὸ δουλεύειν represents in *two*. There is nothing to separate, and so no real difference between them.

(d) § 72. ἀλλὰ συναρξάνεσθαι δεῖ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς τῶν ἀγαθῶν πολιτῶν πολιτεύμασι, καὶ τὸ βέλτιστον αἰετ, μὴ τὸ ῥῆστον ἀπαντας λέγειν· ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ ἡ φύσις αὐτῇ βαδιέται, ἐπὶ τοῦτο δὲ τῷ λόγῳ δεῖ προάγεσθαι διδάσκοντα τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην.

ἐκεῖνο here is τὸ ῥῆστον and τοῦτο is τὸ βέλτιστον; the reference of the pronouns is the reverse of that which the order of the words would lead us to expect.

One of the requisites in a speaker is 'ethical' proof—i.e. the suggestion to the minds of an audience of the possession of a character meet for their approval (τῷ ποιούσιν τινὰς ὑπολαμβάνειν τοὺς λέγοντας, Aristotle, *Rhet.* III. 1. 1). But the obtrusive employment of language designed to attract awakens suspicion and defeats its own object (ὡς γὰρ πρὸς ἐπιβουλευόντα διαβάλλονται, *ibid.* III. 2. 5). What is true of language is no less true of 'ethical' proof. It is only too easy to protest that one is an honest man. The art is to conceal the art (δεῖ λανθάνειν ποιούντας).

The reversed use of the demonstrative pronouns here offers an example of artistic 'ethical' proof. When Demosthenes is speaking τὸ ῥῆστον retires with ἐκεῖνο into the background. With τοῦτο there advances to claim the attention of his hearers τὸ βέλτιστον (cf. *Ol.* III. 33, where ἐκεῖνα and ταῦτα refer respectively to objects of remoter and more immediate concern).

MARSHALL MACGREGOR.

## AN EPIGRAPHIC CONTRIBUTION TO LETTERS.

INSCRIPTIONS and letters, coupled though they are in the title of a French academy, have as a rule little in common. Literary excellence is rare in the verse, still rarer in the prose of epigraphic monuments, and seldom have these any connexion with the monuments of literature. There are, however, exceptions to this rule, and one of them, less known than it should be, seems to deserve a brief notice. Of the documents preserved on stone in Asia Minor few besides the *Res Gestae* of Augustus are definitely known to have been placarded in more than one city, and chief among those important few is the decree of the Commonalty of Asia (*κοινὸν Ἀσίας*) relative to the introduction of the Julian calendar about 9 B.C. Apart from its historical value, this decree has two features of literary interest: (1) The splendid preamble in praise of Augustus,<sup>1</sup> evidently much admired at the time, since it is imitated in a similar document drafted several years later; (2) the casual mention in this preamble of Tullus, the friend of Propertius, revealing to us his full name and an otherwise unknown incident in his career. In order to appreciate these features we require an amended text. The fragmentary copies found at Apamea, Dorylaeum, Eumeneia, and Priene were blended by Th. Mommsen and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf into the fairly complete version (*Ath. Mitt.* XXIV., p. 275 ff.) revised and annotated by W. Dittenberger in 1905 (*Orientalis Gr. Inscr. sel.* 458), and adopted with some variations in 1906 by the latest editor, F. Frhr. Hiller von Gaertringen (*Inscr. von Priene* 105); but there are lacunae still unfilled, and some of the suggested supplements seem inadequate. In the following text the restorations not due to previous editors are in the main derived from the later decree imitating ours:<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wilamowitz remarks that the draftsman's style rises to the high level of his task (*Ath. Mitt.* XXIV., 1899, p. 292). As to the bearing of this text on the history of Christian origins, cf. A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (4th ed. 1923), pp. 313, 317; E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (1924), p. 157, note 2.

<sup>2</sup> The number of letters to a line varies from

- 32 ἐπε[ιδὴ ἡ θέλω] διατάξασα τὸν βίον ἡμῶν πρόνοια  
σπουδῇ εἰσεν[εκα]-  
[μ]ένῃ καὶ φιλοτιμίαν τὸ τελήστατον τῶν βίων  
διεκόσμη[σεν ἀγαθὸν]  
ἐνεκαμένη τὸν Σεβαστόν, ὃν εἰς εὐεργεσίαν ἀνθρώ-  
[πων] ἐπλή-  
35 ρωσεν ἀρετῆς, (ὥ)σπερ ἡμεῖν καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς  
σιωτῆρα χαρισαμένη]  
τὸν παύσαντα μὲν πόλεμον κοσμήσαντα [δὲ εἰρήνην,  
ἐπιφανὲς δὲ]  
ὁ Καίσαρ τὰς ἐλπίδας τῶν προλαβόντων [εὐαγγέλια  
πάντων ὑπερ]-  
έθηκεν, οὐ μόνον τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ γεγονότ[ας εὐεργέτας  
ὑπερβα]-  
λόμενος ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἐσομένοις ἐλπιδ[α] ὑπολιπὼν  
ὑπερβολῆς].  
40 ἥρξεν δὲ τῶν κόσμων τῶν δι' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελί[ων  
ἡ γενέθλιος ἡμέρα]  
τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς δὲ Ἀσίας ἐψηφισμένης ἐν Σμύρῃ  
[ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως]  
Δευκίου Οὐολκακίου Τόλλου, γραμματεύοντος  
Παπ[α]α, μαρτυρίαν]  
τῷ μεγίστῳ γ' εἰς τὸν θεὸν καθευρόντι τειμὰς εἶναι  
[στέφανον].  
Παῦλλος Φάβιος Μάξιμος ὁ ἀνθύπατος τῆς ἐπαρ-  
χίας [ἐπὶ σωτηρίας]  
45 ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου δεξιᾶς καὶ [γ]νῶμης ἀπεσταλμένος  
εὐ[εργεσίαν] ἰδ[ί]-  
οις εὐεργέτησεν τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, ὧν εὐεργεσιῶν τὰ  
μεγέθ[η] ἱκανῶς  
εἰπεῖν οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐφίκοιτο, καὶ τὸ μέχρι νῦν ἀγροηθέν  
ὑπὸ τῶν [Εἰληθ]-  
νων εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τειμὴν εὗρετο, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς  
ἐκείνου γ[ενέ]-  
49 σεως ἀρχεῖν τῷ βίῳ τὸν χρόνον· δι' ὃ κτλ.

The filling of the gaps in such a piece of rhetoric is a question of fitness, not of formulae. Only a few of the supplements suggested above seem to require explanation. L. 37: πάντων is from l. 7 of the later text, εὐαγγέλια from l. 40 of ours. Our draftsman skilfully secures solemnity by repeating salient words,<sup>3</sup> and the εὐαγγελίων of l. 40 finds here its counterpart. We know from the Fourth Eclogue that a Messianic πρόληψις of good tidings was common. For ὑπερέθηκεν, 'overpassed,' in the vivid sense of crossing a boundary, cf. Strabo 668: λαοὺς . . . τὸν Ταῦρον ὑπερθέοντας. L. 41: The restoration ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως is certain. Dating in a document such as this was necessarily in κοινὸν style—namely, by the high-priest of the year; cf. the coin

48 (l. 41) to 55 (l. 32); cf. the facsimile in Deissmann, *op. cit.*, p. 317. I am much indebted to Mr. Tod for criticism and suggestions.

<sup>3</sup> The repetitions, evidently deliberate, are: εἰσενεκαμένη—ἐνεκαμένη (32, 34), εὐεργεσίαν—εὐεργέτας (34, 38), διεκόσμησεν—κοσμήσαντα (33, 36), ἐλπίδας—ἐλπίδα (37, 39), ὑπερβαλόμενος—ὑπερβολῆς (38, 39), ἐπαρχίας—ἐπαρχίαν (44, 46), εὐεργέτησεν—εὐεργεσιῶν (46), εὐρημασίαν—εὐρετο (45, 48), τειμὰς—τειμὴν (43, 48).

inscribed κοινού Ἀσίας, and dated ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἀλεξάνδρου Κλέωνος Σαρδιανού (*B.M. Cat. Lydia*, p. 251, nos. 104, 105);<sup>1</sup> also the Ephesus inscription of 91/92 A.D., dated both by the proconsul M. Fulvius Gillo and by the κοινόν date: ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως τῆς Ἀσίας Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Φησέλνου (*Museion k. Bibl.*, 1878-1880, p. 180; *R. Ét. gr.* II., 1889, p. 26; *Forsch. in Eph.* II., no. 48). Mommsen was the first to identify our Tullus as the friend of Propertius, but regarded him as γραμματεὺς of Asia (*Ath. Mitt.*, l.c., p. 280); Dittenberger, while avoiding that error, supposed that this lacuna had contained a Roman official title (*Or. Gr.* I. 458, note 28). L. 42: The στέφανος referred to below (l. 56) as τὸν ἐψηφισμένον στέφανον must have been mentioned in l. 43; for μαρτυρίαν, coupled as here with the object through which the testimonial is given, cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1073. 46: ἐπιγραφὴν . . . τήν τε τῶν . . . ἀγώνων μαρτυρίαν καὶ κτλ.<sup>2</sup> Other and minor details in the text as restored above are best justified by the corresponding passage of the Halicarnassus decree (*I.B.M.* 894) passed by the same κοινόν soon after 2 B.C. This is an imitation of the earlier preamble, and runs as follows:

[ἐ]πεὶ ἡ αἰώνιος καὶ ἀθάνατος τοῦ παντὸς φύσις  
τὸ [με]-  
[γ]ιστὸν ἀγαθὸν πρὸς ὑπερβαλλούσας εὐεργεσίας  
ἀνθρώπῳ]-  
ποῖς ἐχαρίσατο Καίσαρα τὸν Σεβαστὸν ἐνε[κ]αμένη,  
[τ]ῷ[ν]  
5 τῷ καὶ ἡμᾶς εὐδαίμονι βίῳ πατέρα μὲν τῆς [ἐαυ]τοῦ  
πα-  
τ[ρ]ίδος θεᾶς Ῥώμης Δία δὲ πατρῶν καὶ σωτῆρα  
τοῦ κο[ιν]οῦ]-  
[γ]νοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους, οὗ ἡ πρόνοια τὰς  
πάντων [ἐλπι]-  
[δ]ας οὐκ ἐπλήρωσε μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπερῆρεν·  
εἰρηγενό[ν]-  
[σ]ι μὲν γὰρ γῆ καὶ θάλαττα, κτλ.

In ll. 7-8 we may read [ἐλπίδ]ας instead of Hirschfeld's [εὐχ]ας, thus obtaining the key to the restoration of l. 37 in the earlier document.

Much of our interest in that docu-

ment must lie in the fact that it sheds light on a friend of Propertius and through him on the elegies (I. 1 and 6; III. 22). The reason for his friend's journey to Asia is evident from the poet's remark: 'ibis et acceptis pareris imperiis';<sup>3</sup> Tullus was to hold there some high post, military or administrative. That he enjoyed the visit thus foreshadowed and stayed there several years is known from the question: 'Frigida tam multos placuit tibi Cyzicus annos?' (III. 22). We now further learn that about 15 to 10 B.C. he received in Asia the highest honour—short of promotion to the rank of godhead, by that time reserved for Augustus and his near relations—which its citizens could bestow: at the election preceding the Smyrna assembly (l. 41) they elected him for the year high-priest and president of the κοινόν Ἀσίας (ll. 41-42). As nephew and namesake of the consul who had been colleague of Augustus in 33 B.C., the younger L. Volcaciū Tullus probably had not only rank but also riches; if his year of office was 13 B.C., in which fell the fifth celebration of the Ῥωμαία Σεβαστή at Pergamon, he would have been agonothete of that festival as well as high-priest, and for such a combination of costly functions the choice of a rich man would have been essential. In any case the choice of the nephew was doubtless a tribute of homage to Augustus, with whose second consulship the uncle had been associated; how dangerous was that association plainly appears from the fact that their successors, the consuls of 32 B.C.,<sup>4</sup> were strong partisans of Antony; no man in Asia can have seemed to the κοινόν more eligible as high-priest of 'the god'<sup>5</sup> than a representative of the statesman who had sided with Octavian two years before Actium. The identity revealed by our text of this statesman's

<sup>1</sup> Gaebler calls this high-priest 'eponymus Provinzialoberpriester' (*Z. f. Num.* XXIV., 1903-04, p. 256<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> The patronymic of Papias is probably omitted because he was of secondary rank; cf. the names in *I. G. Rom.* 1756, ll. 6, 120. For another γραμματεὺς Ἀσίας see *Forsch. in Eph.* III., no. 40.

<sup>3</sup> If we prefer to this reading of Postgate that of Hosius, 'accepti pars eris imperii,' the inference as to the official position of Tullus remains unaltered.

<sup>4</sup> Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and C. Sosius; cf. Pauly-Wiss. Hbbd. XIX., 324.

<sup>5</sup> The full style of the high-priest was ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ, *A. J. A.* XVIII., 1914, p. 355.

name with that of his nephew adds point to the challenge: 'tu patru meritas conare anteire secures' (I. 6, 19); this was as much as to say: 'Do

your best to adorn the name L. Volcarius Tullus even more than did your uncle the consul.'

W. H. BUCKLER.

## NOTE ON TACITUS' SUMMARY OF THE REIGN OF AUGUSTUS.

TAC. ANN. I. 9-10.

IN view of the recent discussions of this famous summary of the reign of Augustus it may be of interest to see how far Tacitus' statements agree with historical facts and how much depends on his own personal feelings.

The summary is divided into three parts: A list of coincidences, favourable comment, and unfavourable criticism. The last is again subdivided into two parts—comments on his public policy and his private life.

The coincidences and the favourable comments are all in agreement with the *Monumentum Ancyranum* (except naturally the first).

### Coincidences (I, 2):

Tac. Ann. I. 9.	<i>Monumentum Ancyranum</i> .
Time and place of death	
Number of consulships ...	Sect. 4.
Tribunician powers thirty-seven years ...	Sect. 4.
Twenty-one times imperator ...	Sect. 4.
Other distinctions ...	Sect. 4 ff., Sect. 12 ff.

### Favourable comments (4-6):

Forced into civil war ...	Sect. 1.
Concessions to Lepidus ...	Sect. 10.
Vengeance on murderers	Sect. 2.
Refused absolute power	Sect. 5 ff.
Frontiers and fleet ...	Sect. 3 briefly, 25 ff. in detail.
Justice at home ...	Implied in 3 ff.
Consideration for allies ...	Sect. 3 init.
City adorned ...	Sect. 19-21.

The only matters in the *Monumentum Ancyranum* not included in Tacitus' summary are: Land grants to the soldiers, largess to the people and the treasury, census, laws to revive old customs, games, the triumphs of peace. It will thus be seen that into his brief half-page Tacitus has compressed a surprisingly large proportion of the facts mentioned in Augustus' own précis.

The statements offered by Augustus' critics are in nearly every instance either facts confirmed by contemporary evi-

dence, or charges which other authorities affirm were made against him.

### Adverse criticism (Tac. Ann. I, 10):

(a) <i>Public policies</i> (1-3):	
Attracted soldiers by bribes	Cic. Att. 16, 8, 1; Vell. 2, 61, 2.
Collected army with own funds ...	<i>Monu. Anc.</i> , Sect. 1.
Seduced troops of consuls	Cic. Phil. 3, 3, 6; App. B.C. 3, 45.
Seized praetorship ...	Cic. Phil. 5, 16, 45.
Contrived death of Hirtius	Suet. Aug. 11.
Contrived death of Pansa	Suet. Aug. 11; Brut. ad Cic. 1, 6.
Seized the army ...	Dio 46, 42.
Forced his election to the consulship ...	Dio 46, 45.
Used the army given him against State ...	Dio 46, 43 ff.
Sex. Pompey tricked by peace ...	Dio 48, 46, 1.

The final peace was blood-stained. Tacitus represents the critics justifying this statement by citing the two most serious defeats sustained by Augustus' army: the defeats of Lollius, B.C. 21, in Gaul, and Varus in Germany, A.D. 9; and by three very prominent executions: that of Varro, the brother-in-law of Maecenas, for conspiracy, of Egnatius Rufus for conspiracy, and Julius Antonius for adultery with Julia. The further charge that Augustus was actuated by lust for power rather than a desire to avenge his great-uncle is a commonplace. While it is not possible to prove that 'the proscriptions, the confiscations, were measures which not even the perpetrators could approve,' the triumvirs can hardly have been charmed with a proscription list which was headed with the names of a brother of Lepidus, an uncle of Antonius, and a cousin of Augustus. Two of the charges seem to be without foundation—namely, that Lepidus was deceived under the pretence of friendship, and Antonius through the treaties of Tarentum and Brundisium.

## (b) Criticisms of Augustus' private life (4-6):

Hasty marriage with Livia	Dio 48, 44, 2.
Intimacy with Tediū ...	(Unknown. Error in manuscript transmission.)
Intimacy with Vedius Pollio ...	Sen. <i>de Ira</i> 3, 40.
Accepted divine honours	Cf. Immolatio Caesaris Hostia in Calendar at Cumae.

Two other charges are made: That Livia was a scourge to the State (as the mother of Tiberius) and to the house of Caesar (as instrumental in causing the deaths of Gaius and Lucius), and that Tiberius was selected as an heir by Augustus that his own good qualities might be conspicuous by contrast with Tiberius' gloomy nature. While this can hardly be the case, it is true that Augustus felt frequently

prompted to apologise for Tiberius' unfortunate disposition (Suet. *Tib.* 68, 3). Both these charges arise from Tacitus' conception of Tiberius' character as a man and as a ruler, and we accept or reject them as we accept or reject Tacitus' verdict on Tiberius.

It appears, then, that in defence of Augustus Tacitus has emphasised the very things which Augustus himself chose to mention in recording his own deeds—that in criticism of his public acts he has (with two exceptions) preferred charges that can be shown to have been current at the time, and that his strictures on Augustus' private life are coloured only by his thorough-going hatred of Tiberius. He does not descend to the salacious details of Suetonius (*Aug.* 71).

LOUIS E. LORD.

## DEFRUTVM.

OF a *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae et Britannicae*, published in 1565, its editor, Thomas Cooper says: 'tam accurate congestus, ut nihil pene in eo desyderari possit.' But it is ill to boast in scientific matters, and over the word DEFRTVM Thomas trips. For he gives: 'New wine sodde, untill a thirde part be boyled away,' quoting Pliny as his authority. But neither Pliny nor Varro nor anybody else holds this view.

It may be worth while to examine some of the views put forward.

In 1740 appeared a new edition of Robertus Stephanus' *Thesaurus*, re-edited by Birrius and published at Basel. Under DEFRTVM we find: 'Est vinum coctum usque ad consumptionem mediae partis, a defervendo dictum (*V. Plin.*, lib. 14, cap. 9).' He notes, however, that Columella (*XII.* 21) explains DEFRTVM as 'mustum' boiled down to a third of its original bulk; and he might have added Varro to the same effect.

It appears that the Basel editor, in giving this interpretation, disagreed with Stephanus; and he defends himself by reference to a book on diet by a Spaniard, Ludovicus Nonnius, or Luis Nuñez. This work was published at Antwerp in 1646, and it contains a full, if somewhat confused, discussion of *defrutum* and its cognates by a man who knew the thing at first hand; for Spain, like Italy, France, and South Africa, uses a sort of *defrutum* to this day.

This is what Nonnius says in Book IV., chap. xiii., of his *Diaeticon sive de re cibaria*. 'Mulso succedant Vina dulcia quae apud veteres magno in honore fuerunt, nunc vix in usu sunt; immo nomina paene obsoleta. Praecipua erant sapa, defrutum, passum, carenum.' On *defrutum* he quotes Varro from the grammarian Nonius Marcellus: 'si mustum ex duabus partibus ad tertiam redigatur deferve-

faciendo, defrutum dicitur.' This is supported by the authority of Columella (*loc. cit.*): 'Mustum quam dulcissimum decoquitur ad tertias: defrutum vocatur'; and Pliny's difference of opinion (*loc. cit.*) is noted.

This difference between the authorities as to the extent of boiling down is of minor importance. Pliny (*loc. cit.*) says that it was called *defrutum* when boiled down to a half, and *sapa* if boiled down to a third, while Varro (*loc. cit.*) reverses the proportions. Columella and, apparently, Palladius<sup>1</sup> support Varro. It seems very probable that Pliny was making a mistake, *more suo*. However, as Nuñez says, 'Exigua iater sapa & defrutum est differentia.'

More important is the point that neither before boiling nor after can the liquid be called *vinum* except in a rather loose way, as we apply the term 'wine' to fruit syrups. Before boiling it is *mustum* (must), the unfermented grape-juice, called in the older commentaries 'new wine.' It is noteworthy that the weightier authorities, Varro and Columella, definitely call it *mustum* (*cf. Verg. G. I.* 295); it is Pliny who used *vinum* in the extended sense, and even he makes it clear from his discussion in *N.H.* XIV. 16, that if he were speaking precisely he would call these fruit syrups *vina facticia*—artificial wines. It is regrettable that so many lexicographers, not excluding the editors of the German *Thesaurus*, refer to *defrutum* as '*vinum decoctum*,' and that the most popular of all our commentators on Vergil writes (*ad Georg. I.* 295), 'The "must" . . . was frequently made into wine by artificial methods and that of boiling down was frequently employed, the wine so made being called by various names . . . *sapa* . . . *defrutum*,' without making it quite clear that ordinary wine is not meant. The moment you boil the grape-juice, of course, you destroy the fermentation and your resultant is a syrup.

<sup>1</sup> Palladius is not accessible in Johannesburg.

It is interesting and significant to note that this secondary use of *vinum* is against the law; for Ulpian (*Dig.* 33. 6. 9) says: '<Vini appellatione> defrutum non continetur, quod potius conditurale loco fuit'—i.e., it is to be regarded rather as a preserve.

Akin to *defrutum* and *sapa* were several other preparations. Nuñez mentions *carenum* and explains it, on the authority of Isidorus, as must be boiled down to two-thirds ('tertia parte amissa'). *Passum* is prepared from raisins: 'Passum nominabant si in vindemia uvam diutius coctam legerent, eamque passi essent in sole aduri.' (It hardly surprises us to find the doctor suggesting derivation from 'patior,' just as the grammarians, including Servius, derive *defrutum* from *fraudare*, 'quod quasi fraudem patitur,' in spite of the broad hint in its Greek equivalent *ἐφρα*.)

As for the qualities of *defrutum*, it was, of course, sweet: Plautus, *Pseud.* 741, mentions it in a list of *res dulces*; dark in colour (*cf.* *Stat. Silv.* IV. 9, 39, 'dulci defruta vel lutosca caeno,' of which the Oxford translation, 'must with the sweet less boiled and thickened,' is inadequate); rich and thickish (Vergil calls it *pinguis*, *G.* IV. 269); becoming darker, richer and thicker with boiling; but surely never a 'jelly,' as Ramsay (*Antiq.*) and Smith (*Dict. Ant.*) call it; for even when boiled down, as we know it at the Cape, to one-fourth, it is quite liquid, with a specific gravity, according to modern experts, of 1.35 [Perold: *Annale van Univ. Stellenbosch*]. While boiling it was also very liable to become foam-flecked; Vergil's housewife scums it with leaves (*G.* I. 295); and in the *Excerpta Grammatica Codicis Bobiensis*, V. 481, it is called 'spumatum.'

It was used (a) to sweeten or to give flavour to certain wines ('ferociam vini frangunt,' Plin. *N.H.*, XIV. 19. *Cf.* *Cat. Agr.* XXIII. 2, where the instruction is to add a thirtieth part of *defrutum* to the wine); (b) as a preservative for olives—it contains much natural sugar (Cato, *Agr.* VII. 4, 'oleas sine sale in defrutum condito'); (c) it, or its kinsman *sapa*, was used as a drink, 'ein beliebtes Getränk,' says Blümner in the *Handbuch*. Martial, for instance, receives a flask of *sapa* from his friend Umber (IV. 46). But that it could ever have been drunk neat, even when boiled down only to one-half, nobody who knows the thing will believe. Indeed Ovid implies that *sapa* was sometimes mixed with milk, just as wine was mixed with water ('velut crater,' *Fasti* IV. 706). (d) It was used for medicinal purposes, 'necon ex ipso musto fiunt medicamina,' says Pliny, *N.H.* XIV. 19—and Nuñez refers to it as good for liver and bile—'hepatis et lienis obstructiones promovebunt.'

It remains to remark that our present experts in viticulture are well acquainted with the modern equivalent of *defrutum*; that they call it grape-syrup, and are concerned to make it rival 'golden syrup' in commercial value; that its best consistency for this purpose is attained when it is boiled down to about one-fourth of its original bulk; that it is still used to sweeten wines—for instance, the Malaga wines of Spain, where, as in the days of Nuñez, it is called

'arrope'; that the Boers of the Cape, with whom it is very popular, call it 'moskonfyt'—i.e., 'mustum confectum'; and that children's doctors have recently extolled its dietetic virtues.

T. J. HAARHOFF.

University of the Witwatersrand,  
Johannesburg.

NOTE.—My thanks are due to Mr. E. Berridge of the Perse School, Cambridge, for references not here accessible.—T. J. H.

#### ELIDED SPONDEES IN THE SECOND AND THIRD FOOT OF THE VERGILIAN HEXAMETER.

IN his edition of *Aeneid*, Book VI., Norden<sup>1</sup> sides with those who believe *Aeneid* II. 567-588 not to be genuine. As part of the internal evidence against these lines he uses the following argument. In lines 573, 580, and 587 occur *spondaic words* of which the first syllable ends the second foot and of which the second syllable is elided. This formation, he says, is not frequent in Vergil, and it is found on the average once in 89 lines, while in this passage we have it three times in 15 lines. These figures are correct but misleading, for the simple reason that, while Vergil is careful to avoid metrical monotony, he will often nevertheless use even a comparatively rare arrangement more than once in lines not far from each other. Thus no one, I presume, questions the authenticity of *Aeneid* XII. 757 ff., yet three times in 15 lines occurs this same formation:

responsant circa et . . . (XII. 757)

Laurenti diuo et . . . (XII. 769)

sustulerant puro ut . . . (XII. 771)

Compare with these two contiguous lines in Book IX. (677, 678), three not far off in Book III. (188, 200, 222), and other similar examples.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, one of the lines in question (II. 573) contains *Troiae et* in this position, where the same words occur in X. 214 (*Troiae* also is elided in the same place in the line in V. 626). Compare, too, the somewhat analogous *Teucri ac* (IX. 34, 510) in the same place in the line.

Disyllabic words ending in *-m* or a short vowel are, of course, more commonly elided in this position than such disyllables as are spondees, but is the metrical effect notably different? Thus in XII. 773 (two lines after those mentioned above) we have the commoner formation *detulerat fixam et* which gave a sound surely very little varying from that of line 771.

S. K. JOHNSON.

<sup>1</sup> Second Edition, 1916: Anhang XI. 1, 3.

<sup>2</sup> *E.g.*, II. 55, 58, 88, 212, etc.; V. 133, 157, etc.; VI. 451, 481, 514, etc.; VII. 8, 20, 54, etc.; X. 698, 716, etc. Naturally, when, as in the lines criticised, the word with which the long syllable is blended is the monosyllable *et* or *ac*, the metrical effect of the whole line is not the same as when it is a long word, thus making a broken caesura. But it does not effect Norden's point.

## HORACE, ODES I. 14.

*O naus, referent in mare te noui  
fluctus! O quid agis? fortiter occupa  
portum.*

THE last phrase has caused uneasiness (see C.R. XXXIII. 101, and on the other side C.R. XXXIV. 34), on the ground that to make for harbour in a storm does not show courage. At least four verse-translators of repute have instinctively ignored *fortiter*. But it seems quite appropriate, whether it means 'not giving way to despair and ceasing to struggle,' as Greek sailors might in an extremity, or 'with all your might' (see L. and S. s.v.), as Orelli takes it; or indeed the word may combine the two senses. But in any case *a priori* justification is unnecessary now that we have more of Alcaeus (*Ox. Pap.* 1789, fr. 1, col. ii.). In three words Horace is reproducing the lines:

*εἰς δ' ἔχυρον ἡμενα δρόβωμεν  
καὶ μὴ τιν' ὄκνος μολοῦσθαι ἀμύνειν?  
λάβῃ . . .*

The Latin *fortiter* also doubtless assisted the editor of the papyrus to supply a gap a few lines below:

*καὶ μὴ κατασχύνωμεν ἄνανδρῶς?  
ἔσλοις τόκῃας . . .*

H. RACKHAM.

## TACITUS, HISTORIES, II. 86.

'SED procurator aderat Cornelius Fuscus, vicens aetate, claris natalibus. Prima iuventa quietis cupidine senatorium ordinem exuerat.'

Most editors reject the words 'quietis cupidine' of the manuscripts, and Spooner says that they seem impossible. Various emendations have been suggested, the chief being 'inquietis cupidine,' which Spooner adopts, and 'quaestus cupidine,' a suggestion of Grotius adopted by Heraeus. One editor, Simcox, retains the MS. reading, but his interpretation does not carry conviction.

Both the above emendations imply two things:

- (a) That the object of Fuscus in changing his status was one of gain, and
- (b) That his reputation for zeal in later life precludes a desire for quiet in youth.

But both these assumptions seem to me to be without foundation. In the very next sentence Tacitus definitely contradicts the first by saying, 'Non tam praemiis periculorum quam ipsis periculis laetus.'

The second does not take into consideration the different circumstances of Fuscus' youth and his old age. His youth was spent under Nero, at a time when, as Tacitus tells us elsewhere, (*Agric.* 6. 4), 'inertia pro sapientia fuit.' What more natural than that Fuscus should be wise enough to avoid publicity? 'Prima iuventa' will then be equivalent to 'sub Nerone,' and contrasted with 'pro Galba' of the next sentence. 'Idem' will then of course be used, as it commonly is, to mark the contrast between the two periods of Fuscus' life. On the death of the tyrant, Fuscus threw his weight on to the

side of his enemy and successor, all the more vigorously for his enforced inaction.

The reading of the MSS. is therefore quite defensible, and in fact gives a more consistent sense than the emendations proposed.

H. HILL.

## PLUTARCH, LUCULLUS, C. 20.

PLUTARCH, describing the wretched state of debtors in Asia, says that they had to sell their sons and daughters, public memorials, pictures and dedicated statues, and even to become slaves themselves, *τὰ δὲ πρὸ τοῦτου χαλεπώτερα, σχοινισμοὶ καὶ κικλίδες καὶ ἵπποι καὶ στάσεις ὑπαιθροί, καίματος μὲν [ἐν] ἡλίῳ, ψύχους δ' εἰς πηλὸν ἐμβιβαζομένων ἢ πάγον*, so that slavery seemed a release from debt, and peace. L. and S., ignoring *ἵπποι*, say 'κ. . . probably means *waitings at the bar, the law's delays*,' 'σχ. *roping, rope-fences*.' But surely the law's delays and rope-fences are a curious combination, and in any event could hardly be described as *χαλεπώτερα* than the sale of the sufferer's children. And, further, what have they to do with *ἵπποι*? The earlier translators thought, and I believe rightly, that the words described certain forms of torture. The Latin version of Rualdus gives 'Fidiculae, carceres, equulei,' and Langhorne says 'prisons, racks, tortures.' The words, indeed, seem to be borrowed from the 'equulei, et fidiculae, et ergastula' of Seneca, *De Ira* III. 3, a work which Plutarch may have read. It can hardly be doubted that *ἵπποι* are 'equulei,' and it would seem to follow that the other words denote other forms of torture. *κικλίδες* will be 'fidiculae,' the name being due to the fact that the ramifications of the cords resembled lattice-work, while *σχοινισμοὶ* implies that that particular penalty was inflicted by means of ropes. The facts seem rightly stated by the curious miscellanist Caelius Rhodiginus: 'Fidiculae accipiunt pro tormento, quo ab torture sotes funibus alligatis manibus a tergo torquentur vulgo. Ejus certatim meminerunt Seneca, Fabius, caeteri. *σχοινισμός* a Graecis dicitur genus id cruciamenti, aut compar' (X. 5). The *στάσεις* κτλ., as proved by *ἐμβιβαζομένων*, do not refer to uncomfortable visits paid to the creditors, but were, as Rualdus says, 'stationes sub dio per aestum in sole, hieme in luto vel glacie, quo eos compulerunt.'

HERBERT W. GREENE.

A VIRGILIAN REMINISCENCE IN  
APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS.

THE power of an obsession is curiously revealed in the treatment by editors and critics of Sidon. *Carm.*, V. 164 f. This passage occurs in the panegyric on Majorian. The wife of Aetius, filled with jealous fears, tells her husband that Majorian, still a mere youth, is marked out as the coming Emperor, not only by omens and auguries, but by his supremacy in all departments of manly prowess, in each of which he outrivals the boasted heroes of ancient story. In v. 164 she passes from his skill as a boxer to his speed as a runner:

qui uigor in pedibus ! frustra sibi natus Ofelte  
Sicaniam tribuit palmam, plantasque superbas  
haud ita per siccam Nemeen citus extulit  
Arcas. . . .

*Arcas* is Atalanta's son, Parthenopaeus, who, as Statius tells us in a passage which Sidonius has in mind (*Theb.* VI. 561 ff.), won the foot-race at the first celebration of the Nemean games, in the course of the expedition against Thebes. Statius adopts the usual story, that the games were instituted in honour of the boy Opheltes, who was killed by a snake in the absence of his nurse, Hypsipyle. It stands to reason that this Opheltes had no son—then what does *natus Ofelte* mean? And why *Sicaniam*? Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (see index to Luetjohann's ed., s.v. Opheltes), after men-

tioning that Sidonius is recalling Statius' account of the games in honour of Opheltes, says of vv. 164 f.: 'ipse locus de Ophelte obscurus est et sine dubio perturbatus.' But so far from being obscure, the sentence is as clear as daylight if we disabuse our minds of the unfortunate infant aforesaid and remember that Opheltes was the name of Euryalus' father (*Verg. Aen.* IX. 201). *Natus Ofelte* is therefore Euryalus, and *Sicaniam palmam* refers to his victory at the funeral games in Sicily, described in *Aen.* V. Majorian is declared superior (1) to Euryalus, (2) to Parthenopaeus. It is hard to believe that no one has seen this, but to the best of my knowledge the passage has never been correctly explained.

W. B. ANDERSON.

## REVIEWS

### A NEW HISTORY OF GREEK RELIGION.

*Die Religion der Griechen.* Von OTTO KERN. Erster Band: von den Anfängen bis Hesiod. Pp. viii + 307. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. M. 11, unbound; M. 15, bound.

THIS work is marked by outstanding virtues and equally outstanding defects. The former are due to the industry and common sense of the author, together with his first-hand knowledge, not only of the writings and material remains, but also of the land of the Hellenes; the latter spring partly from his mental character—like many of his countrymen he is rather sentimental, and his logic is not always of the best—partly from strange gaps in his reading, wide though that is. His good sense is shown, for example, by the attitude which he takes up (p. 13) towards anthropology and the Comparative Method; by his recognition (p. 33) that the goddess Earth is 'diese Scholle Erde, in der sie lebt' and not the Earth in general; in all he says about stellar cults (as pp. 21, 46, and elsewhere); in his remarks on the relation between spell and prayer (p. 151); and, I would say, in his unqualified rejection of the theory that Apollo is a Lykian god (p. 110). His diligence is apparent from a mere glance at the footnotes of his book, which witness to the reading and digesting of a vast amount of specialist literature, by no means all bearing on the subjects of the works he has hitherto published. But in nearly all that he says (apart from

bare facts) concerning the cult of a Mother Goddess in Greece and elsewhere, for example, I can find little but a reading into ancient religious phenomena of his own amiable feelings towards women. Moreover, where he and every other researcher is obliged to go a little beyond the facts and resort to hypothesis, I cannot find that he reasons well or convincingly. One of the main theses of his book (especially Chap. IX.) is, that the Olympian religion made its way by deliberate propaganda and something amounting almost to persecution of the prehellenic cults; to this neither the facts he adduces nor any others known to the reviewer appear to bear sufficient witness, and some make decidedly against it. The Olympic religion made its way rather because it was incomparably the nobler religion, and attracted the noblest minds in the mixed population of Homeric and posthomeric Greece, notably the minds of Homer and Hesiod. On smaller points, he seems again and again to argue, 'If A, then B; but B; therefore A.' Thus, he asserts that the title Naïos of the Dodonaian Zeus is to be explained by supposing that he displaced an earlier *Quellengott* (pp. 90, 182). So it may be; but what of the equally natural explanation that Zeus took a title from a spring which may or may not have been an important sacred well before his arrival at Dodona? If space permitted, a score of examples of reasoning as bad or worse might easily

be given. The result is that his positive contributions to the theory of the subject will be received with a good deal of doubt by the cautious reader, and not least the etymologies he adopts (e.g., Apollo from ἀπέλλα in the sense of 'fold, enclosure'; Amphitrite, 'of high lineage on both sides,' Aphrodite 'die auf dem Schaume wandelnde'). They seem nowhere to be impossible; but those who remember the many plausible suggestions which once were confidently received and have now passed into limbo will cultivate suspension of judgement here. His reading, if he were an Englishman, would be said to betray insularity, for it seldom goes beyond the works of his own countrymen; thus, very little use is made of books and articles in English, French, and Italian, many of which should have been mentioned, while some would have saved him from slips, or at least from very doubtful assertions. In particular it is curious that for modern Greek folklore he goes to Schmidt instead of Politis.

His anthropology badly needs to be revised and brought up to date—witness, for example, his persistent misuse of the word 'fetish.' As to his ethnology, this is hardly the time to be too certain that the Greeks reached Greece from the north and via Thessaly only, as he seems to do.

But when all deductions have been made, the book remains a notable contribution. The only serious objection to its form is, that as he seems to be writing mainly for specialists, he might have saved space by omitting some translations and utilised it by giving much fuller references to ancient literature; if he is addressing the general educated public, most of his footnotes and addenda will be lost on them. Students of Greek religion ought to add this volume to their libraries and to look forward with interest to the two which are to follow, especially as this one seems rather decidedly to improve towards the end as it gets on firmer ground.

H. J. ROSE.

#### OLYMPIA.

*Olympia, its History and Remains.*

By E. NORMAN GARDINER, D.LITT.  
Pp. xx+316. 129 illustrations (both plates and text blocks). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 30s. net.

DR. NORMAN GARDINER deserves the thanks of English-speaking scholars for this useful guide to Olympia and the various publications concerning its history, antiquities, and excavations. Apart from the monumental German publication (which is not easily accessible to all) of the results of the great excavations, several important papers have appeared in recent years describing and discussing Dr. Dörpfeld's later work on the site. There is also a great mass of literature dealing with the sculptures and other monuments, the origins of the festival and other aspects of this Pan-Hellenic sanctuary. Dr. Gardiner's book is a kind of scientific Baedeker to all this miscellaneous archaeological literature, and is devoted to two main aims—to summarise and illustrate the results of the great German excavations, and to trace the history of Olympia and its festival. It achieves both objects,

but of course cannot be considered complete, and there are some points where a few simple changes would have made the book more practical. The white cover, though handsome, is a mistake from the point of view of the traveller who wishes to use it on the site. He would also be glad if the book were a trifle smaller, and this could have been attained by omitting certain portions without destroying its usefulness. Chapter II., the Geography of the Northwest Peloponnese, the latter part of Chapter III. on the Prehistoric Remains of Kakovatos, Chapter IV. on Peoples and Cults of the Northwest Peloponnese, could have been omitted without spoiling the book. Chapter V. on the Origin of the Olympic Festival is interesting, but the latter part of this which deals with modern speculations as to the *raison d'être* of the games might have been still further compressed, as Dr. Gardiner has already treated the subject fully in the *Hellenic Journal*. The various modern theories cannot be considered certain, for they disagree with one another, and they are hardly essential

for a proper understanding of the monuments of Olympia and their history. This book so reduced in bulk and in a dark buckram binding would be a valuable travelling companion. These points, however, concern only the plan of the volume. The contents of a comprehensive work of this character can, of course, easily be criticised in its details. It is unfortunate that the author did not rewrite the chapter on the Heraion so as to do full justice to Dörpfeld's latest excavations there, which prove that this temple, once regarded as the oldest Greek temple, was built above the ruins of two previous temples, the earliest of which dates from the eighth century B.C. The author is a believer in the northern theory and brings Poseidon as well as Zeus from that religion whence also came a continuous movement of worshippers of the Sky God. He rejects Pausanias' statements about the authorship of the sculptures of the Temple of Zeus and would like to assign them to a native Elean school. He does not discuss the many solutions suggested for this problem, but a list of them in tabular form would have been useful. In dealing with the Great Altar of Zeus on p. 194

he might have referred back to p. 26, where he mentions the prehistoric remains formerly identified with this altar. The apsidal plan of the wings of the Bouleuterion might have been more fully treated and further references given, as, for instance, to the apsidal shrine of classical date of Corinth and to Buschor's belief that some of the early sanctuaries at the Acropolis at Athens also had an apse at one end. More attention might have been paid to minor details. We note mistakes like Dickinson for Dickins and Dittenberg for Dittenberger, while the spelling of Greek names, ancient and modern, seems inconsistent. Sometimes *opisthodomos* is used and sometimes *opisthodomē*, and Hagios Johannes shows two systems. It would have been better, e.g. on p. 140, to have used Antigonos throughout and to have avoided *Monophthalmos*. The footnotes require more revision, and when several books are quoted by their titles, e.g. on p. 28, the names of the authors should have been added. The illustrations are on the whole good, but several of the small line blocks in the text, e.g. Figs. 18 and 36, are not up to the standard of the Clarendon Press.

A. J. B. WACE.

#### EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR INTERPOLATION IN HOMER.

*The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer.* By GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING. Pp. xii+259. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 21s. net. 1925.

MR. BOLLING's aim is excellent. He bids us turn from vain disputing about origins to the tradition. What lines are shown by external witnesses (quotations, scholia, papyri, medieval manuscripts) to be post-Aristarchean, post-Zenodotean, post-Peisistratean? There he stops, since a sixth-century Athenian text is, in his view, the fountain-head: not a jot of earlier material, except what this included, 'seeped' into local texts. That view is disputable: the suggestion that the 'City' texts, for instance, were so called from the markets to which Alexandria exported them, not from their places of origin, is improbable (see Allen, *O. and T.*, pp. 283-296). But that is a detail not essential to B.'s argument.

Summarising his own earlier work, he

asks for definitive rejection, as post-Aristarchean, of some six score lines from the *Iliad*, some nine score from the *Odyssey*. Freed from these, he says, the vulgate of the *Iliad*, at any rate, contains all lines attested for the text of Aristarchus, and not one demonstrably unknown to him. That is impressive, whether we think with Mr. Bolling that the longer texts were killed by the professors, or with Mr. Allen that the Roman publishers are to be thanked. But when we hear that, with the cuts suggested, and no others, the vulgate will agree with Aristarchus 'line for line,' we grow uneasy. What if fresh papyri weakened the authority for other 'formulaic lines' than those now listed? Would they not go to swell the list? What if Γ389, a good line, well placed, and by no means so dispensable as e.g. Γ319, were yet found well attested in papyri? The absence or the presence

of such lines in casual papyri adds little to our knowledge, and our judgment of probabilities must in part be based on the intrinsic value of the lines.

There are many things, in fact, to give us pause. 'B 558 om. Aristarchus,' Mr. Bolling writes, and relegates the famous line to limbo, 'post-Aristarchean.' But we thought that Aristarchus knew the line and athetised it. Witness Aristonicus (Schol. A on Γ230): 'Idomeneus in the *Review* is next to Ajax, as is consistent: so the line which some read in the Catalogue is to be deprecated (παραιτητέον = ἀθετητέον, see Allen in *C.R.*, 1901, pp. 8-9): the Athenians were not next Ajax.' So vivid is the report. We almost hear the master lecturing and see the pupils marking the offending words. Mr. Bolling suggests that what Aristonicus meant was this: 'The line was absent from the master's text, and I reject it, though I find it in some texts.' But to interpret scholia in this light-hearted fashion is to cut away the basis of our knowledge. B's grim congratulation to 'the junior editor' of the Oxford text (p. 3), in reference to that same line, does less than justice to the Oxford scholar's subtle humour.

We pass, with hopes a little clouded, to the region where 'continuous *recensio* becomes impossible.' Bethé thinks, 'except for *Kleinigkeiten*,' that the text of Aristarchus was identical with the Athenian *Mutterschrift*. To Wilamowitz 'before Zenodotus lies chaos.' Both, we agree, exaggerate. For Zenodotus, as Mr. Bolling says, our evidence is fragmentary and biassed: he may sometimes have been guided by manuscripts where he is said to have merely slashed at the text. Our witnesses sometimes profess to know the reasons for his *atheses* and omissions, sometimes frankly own their ignorance (e.g., Aristonicus on B552-5: 'Z. athetised, perhaps because . . . but Homer often . . .'). There speaks Aristarchus, honestly and wisely). But, says Mr. Bolling, since Z. left no commentary, none could ever know his reasons. So the later critics guessed maliciously and wrongly. Mr. Bolling's guesswork is at least benevolent. But Z. had pupils. Does it follow that, because he left no commentary, there was no tradition and no knowledge of

his reasons? That might be the unhappy result if some of us should print our text of 'Homer' without notes. But to suggest that Aristarchus never knew, but always guessed at, Z.'s processes of thought, then polemised against them, puts a strain upon our credulity.

Z. athetised A 4-5, we know not why. Was *αἰνους* a stumbling-block? Did he resent the reference to Zeus? Mr. Bolling finds it 'difficult to see a reason unless the lines were absent from some MSS.' 'If so,' he goes on, 'the interpolation will have been made,' etc. Would the absence of the lines from some of the texts known to Z. dispose of them as certainly interpolations? Yes, says Mr. Bolling. Leaf, in deprecating the assumption of lacunae, said it would be hard to show that any line, when once admitted into the tradition, had been lost. Mr. Bolling goes further. Every line in the genuine (i.e., Peisistratean) text was contained in every edition. He states it as a 'working' hypothesis, and seems to use it as a maid of all work.

Plato's paraphrase of A 17-42 (*Rep.* III., 393 D) ignores line 31, which would in fact be irrelevant to his argument, though B. says 'the *ἀπρεπές* would have been grist for Plato's mill.' B. infers that Aristarchus, when he athetised this line, was led by MS. evidence. But Aristonicus says the *athesis* covered 29-31, and 29-30 were in Plato's text, and one objection, which will not hold water, to these same two lines is answered elsewhere in a note which seems Aristarchean. It looks as if the critic said, 'The first two lines are defensible, but the whole passage weakens the threat and is *ἀπρεπές*, and must go.' Mr. Bolling bids us treat the lemma, *τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω*, as corrupt, and change *ἀθετοῦνται ὅτι λύουσι τοῦ ἀθετεῖται ὅτι λύει*. So anxious is he to get rid of 31, he actually hints that concubinage might, as Aristarchus thought, be some alleviation of the royal threat.

One more example: for Γ423-6 Zenodotus read a single line, 'But she herself sat down before Alexander.' His reason, says the scholiast, was the *ἀπρεπές* of Aphrodite waiting on Helen like a servant. Mr. Bolling, ignoring this, declares: 'The text of Z. offers no

difficulty. Aphrodite has played her part and is dropped by the poet. The interpolator . . . sought to give her a formal dismissal. The attempt was unsuccessful, for he too simply drops her at the end.' Astonishing interpolator! He could write lines 423-6, but could not manage 'So the smiling goddess went away.' Frankly, I don't believe it. Guess for guess, I prefer the scholiast. Z. may have had before him both the shorter and the longer versions, and have used his judgment; but, if so, it does not follow he was right, and Aristarchus wrong. Nor is it true that the shorter version 'offers no difficulty.' When Iris fetched her, Helen was at work in the megaron. When Paris was snatched from the field, Aphrodite put him down in the thalamos. When Helen came back, 'her maidens turned to their work, and she went to the thalamos,' if Aristarchus is right, but 'sat down opposite Alexander,' presumably in the megaron, if we follow Zenodotus.

One 'difficulty' there is in the longer version. At 426 'the interpolator' betrays himself by giving Helen an epithet reserved elsewhere for Athene, 'child of aegis-bearing Zeus.' That surely is decisive? Read again, and note how Helen was first simply 'white-armed Helen,' 121, but became in 171 *δία γυναικῶν*, just before shame made her call herself 'the dog-faced,' 180. Then at 199, with Homer's usual chias-

mus of effect, she is *Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα*, and at 228, *τανύπεπλος* . . . *δία γυναικῶν*, just before she heaps upon herself reproaches for the second time. Now, in the sequel, what shall Homer call her? At 383 Aphrodite went to summon 'Helen,' and said, 'Come hither,' giving her no title. Helen would not go until the goddess threatened. Then 'the child of Zeus' became afraid. But the climax is not yet. 'When they came to the palace, the maidens turned to their work at once, but Helen, glorious among women, went to the high-roofed thalamos. And the goddess took a chair and made her sit in front of Alexander—there sat Helen, daughter of the aegis-bearer Zeus, turning her eyes away.' It is true that at the crisis of her failure and humiliation a great poet has bestowed on Helen the high title which in general he keeps for a bright goddess. Presently, when Paris leads the way, it is 'his wife' who follows.

These are only illustrations. As an amateur, I wish to speak with all due deference of Mr. Bolling's diligence and erudition. Though I think his methods will not disperse the darkness which the gods have laid on the Homeric battlefield, I have read his book with interest, and remember Caer's phrase, about the expert who had taunted him with ignorance: 'He thinks us his opponents. We are fellow-workers.'

J. T. SHEPPARD.

#### STUDIES OF CLASSICAL LITERATURE.

*Irony: An Historical Introduction.* By J. A. K. THOMSON. Pp. 242. London: Geo. Allen and Unwin, 1926. 7s. 6d.

*Leaves of Hellas: Essays on some Aspects of Greek Literature.* By MARSHALL MACGREGOR. Pp. vii + 300. London: Edward Arnold and Co., 1926.

PROFESSOR THOMSON'S book, as I judge from its avoidance of the Greek language and the large quantity of brisk translation and paraphrase which it contains, is aimed chiefly at the Greekless. It is written in a lively and readable manner with an assumption (doubtless unconscious) of mastery of the subject; and it contains a fair number of acute observations, not all of them new. But

it is by no means a safe guide. Within the first twenty pages (1) we are told that is extraordinary that Plato has nowhere discussed the full meaning and nature of Irony. 'Why do we never get from him the subtle discussion we should have expected?' Not, surely, if we knew Plato well. (2) The Greeks are 'so trite and inarticulate' about Irony. They could scarcely be both at once; but I suspect that the phrase should be 'trite or inarticulate,' the latter adjective being designed for Plato and the former (save the mark!) for Aristotle, whose definition of Irony the author mentions with some disfavour but *does not quote*. And (3) the plot of an Athenian comedy

'must be the defeat of the Alazon by the Eiron,' the only exception being the *Birds*. If Professor Thomson did not invent this, he is at least responsible for his acceptance of it. In detail, too, there are some serious errors—e.g., *Il.* VI. 465 is translated 'before I hear your' (σῆς) 'cry and the rude hands laid upon thee;' and in a rendering of Persius' *Prologue* we read 'MESSER GASTER, MASTER OF ARTS, who giveth wit at need,' where (1) there is no violent emphasis to justify the small capitals, (2) MESSER is not in the Latin and is ξενικόν, (3) GASTER is ξενικώτερον, rendering in fact *ignotum per ignotius*, (4) MASTER OF ARTS has acquired connotations which do not belong to the original and has practically lost the central meaning of *magister*, and (5) 'at need' suggests that the donor is rather *parvus* than *largus*.

In the secular struggle this book does not range Professor Thomson in the ranks of the *εἰσώτες*.

It is refreshing to turn to Mr. MacGregor, who has here collected the *Lesefrüchte* of several years spent in teaching. His topics are various, ranging from Hesiod to Lucian, with a charming essay on Greek (and other)

dogs to round off the volume; but in dealing with each he exhibits real learning, not confined to the ancient languages, and his scholarship is unimpeachable. Perhaps the best essays are one on Pindar (supplemented by workmanlike translations in verse), in which he shows, as against a dictum of Professor Conway's, that when the poet praises his patrons he praises them only for what they really possess, and never sacrifices his self-respect, and one on Lucian, where he unconsciously provides a complete answer to Professor Thomson's superficial condemnation of that writer's character. At times it is not easy to accept Mr. MacGregor's conclusions—e.g., I find it hard to digest his notion that the *ἀλογονέξω τοῦ μυθεύματος* in the case of Oedipus was really the Sphinx; but his views are always given with due reserve and entitled to respect, and his admirably complete series of references enables the reader to check his reasoning at every point. About Mr. MacGregor's style there is a certain astringency which occasionally touches the verge of harshness; but in general its effect is wholesomely bracing, and the book may be warmly commended to all lovers of Greek literature.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

#### ALY'S GREEK LITERATURE.

*Geschichte der griechischen Literatur.*

By WOLF ALY. Pp. xvii + 418.  
9½ × 7 in. Bielefeld and Leipzig:  
Velhagen and Klasing, 1925.

THIS book gives us a survey of Greek literature from Homer to Eusebius, and is all the more welcome as the author has adopted a somewhat new method of grouping. His aim is to bring out the influences which went to the making of the classical masterpieces, arranged according to the intellectual tendencies of each age. It is well for once to see Aeschylus separated from his dramatic rivals and to examine him in his relation to Pindar and Xenophanes, and to release our authors from the water-tight compartments usually labelled 'historians,' 'dramatists,' etc., and to regard them as representing certain common lines of thought in each generation, irrespective of the form in

which they chose to cast their ideas. Such a method certainly tends to make the student ignore the artistic setting and the purely aesthetic value of the ancient classics; but Aly has avoided this pitfall and gives full credit to the beauty of the outward form as well as to the spirit of which it is but the envelope.

We by no means always agree with the opinions expressed; but the author deserves our thanks for stirring us up and making us re-examine views which we are prone to accept as axioms that need no proof. He is particularly happy in his just estimate of Xenophon and is far from sharing what one can only call the scornful contempt of many modern critics. We are also grateful for his appreciation of Lysias and that delicate, exquisite, and subtle art which so rarely receives its due recognition.

Aly believes in a much-divided Homer, but gives no convincing reason for his creed. After the researches of recent years one is surprised to find the *Catalogue* still regarded as among 'the very latest' (*allerspätesten*) portions of the two epics; nor do we think the author justified in declaring that the late composition of the *Doloneia* is universally admitted (p. 20). Our literary appreciation of the *Odyssey* is hardly helped by the suggestion that Odysseus was originally the moon (p. 22). Nor can we subscribe to the view that 'the technique of the two epics makes it certain that they were not completed in the course of one and the same generation' (p. 23). If we accept the canons

of Aly's school we must deny every author the right and indeed the ability to repeat himself or to change his tone and method. Much reading of Homeric criticism makes it increasingly difficult to believe that the author of *Paradise Lost* followed it up with *Paradise Regained*, a book so sober in tone and unadorned with similes. We must also seek for the unknown poet who wrote the *Purgatorio* with its moral system so different from that of the *Inferno*, and Mr. Thomas Hardy will have to choose between *Tess* and *Under the Greenwood Tree*; it is obvious that the same man cannot have written two books so different in form and outlook.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

### THE POLITICAL IDEAS OF THE GREEKS.

*The Political Ideas of the Greeks.* By J. L. MYRES. Pp. xii + 271. London: Arnold, 1927. 14s.

THESE lectures afford delightful but not easy reading. The detail demands and deserves continuous close attention. The lecturer's range of knowledge, fertility of ideas, and nimbleness of mind give the reader a sad but salutary sense of his own slow-wittedness; but if all that he has to offer is not readily to be grasped at the first glance, or even at the first reading, it is because there is so much which stimulates reflection. The main business of the book is the examination of a number of terms, *Polis*, *Demos*, *Themis*, *Arkhé* (presumably so transliterated to avoid confusion with Archie: the reason for *Tykhe* is less obvious), *Dike*, *Physis*, *Nomos*, and so on, and the illustration of the development and content of Greek political concepts from the history of verbal usage. In following and testing the argument the references are all-important; it is therefore to be regretted that the notes are arranged in the least convenient way for ready consultation. The subject, which throughout is treated at first hand and not distilled from secondary erudition, is obviously of importance, not only to historians and philosophers, but to all students of Greek civilisation, and no one can fail to profit, both by agreement and difference, from reading a book which is in

the best sense stimulating and suggestive.

In a few points of detail one suspects that statement outstrips evidence. If it can be shown that Homeric kings elicited *themistes* 'by performing ritual acts and thereby putting themselves into communion with the gods or a god' (p. 79), it is a matter of interest and importance for students of religion. If 'disreputable foreign worships like that of Dionysos were quite beneath the notice of the high-priestly Basileus' (p. 130), how very odd that his wife should annually be married to the god! The more probable explanation of the control of the newer forms of state religion by the Archon eponyms is the Greek tendency to give the control of the state religion to the secular head of the state. Occasionally one suspects that the view of an historian has supplanted the contemporary Greek view of the facts. Thus it is true that imperial Athens secured the essential Hellenic command of the Aegean in consideration of a very modest annual levy. But whether this was the way contemporaries looked at it may be doubted, and the statement that no question was raised as to the propriety of the arrangement until trouble arose from the uses to which the Athenians put their accumulated balances may be thought to misrepresent the reason why Athenian imperialism came to grief.

On p. 39 a sharp contrast is drawn between the use of 'demos' and that of 'polis' (*I.G.* II. 5, 186) or 'Athenians' (Hicks and Hill, 32) in Athenian public documents; the first is always used of internal affairs and never in connexion with foreign affairs. Well, Hicks and Hill, 32, is the Erythrai decree; with this the Chalkis decree (Hicks and Hill, 40) is legitimately comparable. But here the oath reads *οὐκ ἀποστήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων . . . καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων βοηθήσω καὶ ἀμυνῶ, εἴαν τις ἀδικῇ τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ πείσομαι τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων*. Admittedly in all foreign treaties the simple name of the peoples concerned is more usual, but again in Dittenberger, *Sylloge*<sup>3</sup>, 151, we have *δῆμος Κορκυραίων* and *δῆμος Ἀθηναίων*.

To Professor Pearson's inaugural lecture,<sup>1</sup> which I think Professor Myres has overlooked, I owe the knowledge that there are four, not three, references to *nomos* in Hesiod. In the fourth (*Erg.* 388) *οὕτως τοι πεδίων πέλεται νόμος*, the word has very much the force which is here given to the root meaning of *thesmos*, 'the regular mode of behaviour.' On the other hand, although in Attica the word *thesmoi* was superseded by *nomoi*, that does not seem to have happened everywhere in Greece (see Busolt, *Gr. Staatskunde* I, p. 456, n. 1).

On the strength of Diomedes' claim in *Iliad* IX. 32-3, Professor Myres claims the right of free speech for all individual members of an Homeric

*agora*. Thersites, according to him (p. 43), spoke outside an *agora*, and therefore was justifiably suppressed. This would be a difficult interpretation, even if Homer had not explicitly opened the scene with the words *οἱ δ' ἀγορῇνδε αὐτὶς ἐπεσσεύοντο νεῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων* (*Iliad* II. 207). Nilsson<sup>2</sup> thinks it certain that 'freedom of speech belonged to the nature of the institution,' but qualifies this opinion by supposing that in practice only the leaders of contingents spoke as representatives of their units. Now at Scheria it is plain that only *σκηπτοῦχοι ἡγήτορες ἢ δὲ μέδοντες* had rights of debate. In this category Diomedes obviously falls, and it is not impossible that, even in the *Iliad*, the right of debate, which Thersites is clearly denied, was restricted to such.

It is possible to take this view of political assemblies and yet to agree with Professor Myres that in judicial assemblies an *amicus curiae* might volunteer a *dike*. But when in the course of his interesting and important discussion of the trial scene on the *Shield* he follows the suggestion of Zimmern that the fee to be given to this man is the lineal ancestor of Athenian *prytaneia*, it is not easy to concur. *πρυτανεία*, it is true, may have been earmarked for the payment of dikasts' fees, which is what he really has in mind. But the two talents of gold in Homer are explicitly a reward; the dikast's fee in theory and in practice was something quite different, a subsistence allowance.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

<sup>1</sup> A. C. Pearson, *Verbal Scholarship and the Growth of Some Abstract Terms*, Cambridge, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> M. P. Nilsson, *Das homerische Königtum*, *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1927, p. 28.

#### DIÈS' AUTOUR DE PLATON.

*Autour de Platon, Essais de Critique et d'Histoire*. Par A. DIÈS. Two vols. Pp. xvi + 615 (pagination continuous for the 2 vols.). Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne, 1927.

M. Diès' two volumes are a most welcome addition to the ever-growing work of high quality on Plato put forth by French scholars. The part of the book to which most readers will probably turn first, the only part absolutely new, is the fourth 'book,'

with its four excellent chapters on (1) Plato's 'transposition' into a higher key of the theses of current rhetorical theory and current Orphicism and 'erotic'; (2) Plato's conception of science; (3) Plato's God; (4) Plato's religion. All these are issues of the first importance, and they are discussed by M. Diès in a way at once thoroughly scholarly and thoroughly fresh, with great fulness and with the characteristic subtlety and point of the best

French prose-writing. The three preceding 'books,' made up of reproductions of a long series of reviews and other short articles, deal successively with (1) the surroundings of the Platonic philosophy (Greek astronomy, anthropology, medicine in the fifth century and the early fourth; the influence of religion on ethics and philosophy generally; the connections between rhetoric and philosophy); (2) Socrates and the 'Socratic problem'; (3) the dialogues themselves. This is, in some ways, a miscellaneous collection, but serious Platonic students will be very thankful to the author for preserving in a readily accessible form so much excellent criticism which might have been lost to use if it had been allowed to remain dispersed over the journals of several years. I would specially commend the excellent historical account in Book I. of the 'Hippocratic problem' and the possible light thrown upon it by the famous allusion to Hippocrates in the *Phaedrus*. Another excellent piece of work is the very full and careful study of the multifarious phases assumed by the quest of modern students after the 'historical' Socrates (Book II.). One can only envy M. Diès his amazing knowledge of the literature of subjects like these. Perhaps, as one of the (may I say?) 'victims' of his kindly and gentle irony, I may be allowed to plead in my own defence that I do not feel myself to be 'killed dead,' as I gather M. Diès thinks I ought, by the criticisms of my friend Mr. W. D. Ross. Mr. Ross has shown, what I should never have dreamed of denying, that Aristotle made a distinction between the doctrine of Socrates and the teachings of Plato. But I fancy both Mr. Ross and M. Diès tend to confuse the distinction with a very different one—a distinction between the doctrine of Socrates and the things Socrates is made to teach in the *Phaedo* and other Platonic dialogues. This is the distinction of which, for my own part, I can find no trace in Aristotle.

There are a number of other points, among the many which M. Diès discusses in his illuminating way, where I suggest that some suspension of judg-

ment is advisable. Thus I cannot feel satisfied, as he does, that the reading he has unearthed from W in *Philebus* 66a is a final restoration of the true text of the most desperate 'crucial' passage in Plato. For the unintelligible πάντα ὅποσα χρὴ τοιαῦτα νομίζειν τὴν αἰδίων ἡρῆσθαι of B, W, according to M. Diès, exhibits, as a correction by the scribe or another, τινὰ ἥδιον in the place of τὴν αἰδίων, and also has τοιαῦτα χρὴ for χρὴ τοιαῦτα. Hence M. Diès proposes to write the concluding words of the long sentence καὶ πάντα ὅποσα τοιαῦτα, χρὴ νομίζειν τινὰ ἥδιον ἡρῆσθαι, and to render 'we must hold that a man (τινὰ) has made a preferable choice' if he gives the palm to μέτρον and 'everything of the kind' rather than to ἡδονή. One would be glad to feel that this is the solution of a bad puzzle, but I am afraid I do not feel it. About the adoption of τοιαῦτα χρὴ for χρὴ τοιαῦτα I have long been of the same mind as M. Diès, and I believe that he is therefore right about the grammar of a difficult sentence. But there is to my mind a fatal objection to τινὰ ἥδιον as a correction of τὴν αἰδίων. ἡδιον ἡρῆσθαι does not mean, what the context would require it to mean, 'has made a better choice,' but 'has made a pleasanter choice.' I do not believe that Plato could have said, in a sentence the whole point of which is that there are many things more worthy of choice than ἡδονή, that the man who chooses these better things ἥδιον ἡρῆται. In the end, as the *Laws* teach, no doubt, the choice of the man who does not put ἡδονή first actually brings in more enjoyment than the choice of the Hedonist. But that is not the point in our passage; the point is that he who chooses τὸ μέτρον chooses wisely and well. Hence I feel bound to fall back on the view, rejected by M. Diès, that the correction in W here is an emendation, an ingenious one reflecting great credit on its maker, but unfortunately, as the context shows, not the right one. I regret that regard for the space of the *Classical Review* prevents further comment on other points of interest in these delightful volumes.

A. E. TAYLOR.

## VON ARNIM ON ARISTOTLE.

*Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Politik. Die drei aristotelischen Ethiken. Arius Didymus' Abriss der peripatetischen Ethik.* By HANS VON ARNIM. Three parts. Pp. 130, 142, 161. Vienna and Leipzig: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1924-26. Paper. M. 3.30, 4.50, 5.

THE first two of these studies are inspired by Werner Jaeger's brilliant and stimulating work on Aristotle, published in 1923 (see C.R. XXXVIII. [1924], pp. 193 ff.), which has again turned attention to the discussion of the origin and development of the more important Aristotelian treatises.

In the first von Arnim deals with the composition of the *Politics*. In Jaeger's view ΒΓ and ΗΘ contain Aristotle's 'Urpolitik,' written at Assos under Platonic influence, the other four books being composed later, when he had modified his views after his researches into Greek constitutions.

According to von Arnim, the oldest part of the *Politics* is Α and Γ, of which Α has been modified by the omission of the original conclusion and the addition of the discussion of χρηματιστική, and Γ by the omission of the discussion of Aristocracy as the best constitution. Both books show close connexion with Platonic views, and are earlier than Aristotle's return to Athens in 335/4 B.C. The second instalment, ΔΕΖ, was written after a long interval, during which his views underwent considerable change. Aristotle had now come to the conclusion that his original theory of the ideal state in Γ must be abandoned. Β, which forms the third instalment, was written in 330 B.C. as an introduction to the discussion of the best form of constitution, but incorporates an earlier criticism of Plato's *Republic*. The last portion, ΗΘ, contains the unfinished treatise on the ideal state. The epilogue of the *Nicomachean Ethics* shows that Aristotle had intended to coordinate the whole work, but was unable to carry out his intention; hence the inconsistencies of the *Politics* as it has come down to us.

In the second study von Arnim deals with the question of the relations

between the three ethical treatises in the Aristotelian Corpus, and in particular with the date and genuineness of the *Magna Moralia*.

In Jaeger's view the *Eudemian Ethics* is the 'Urethik,' showing Platonic influence, being intermediate between the *Protrepticus* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and dating from about 345 B.C., while the *Magna Moralia* is a handbook composed by some later Peripatetic on the basis of the two other *Ethics*.

Von Arnim subjects the language, terminology, and doctrines of the *M.M.* to an elaborate analysis, which it is impossible even to summarise here, and concludes that a distinct development can be traced from the *M.M.* through the *E.E.* (which he regards as a genuine work, though not so early in date as Jaeger holds) to the *E.N.*, and that the *M.M.* is a genuine work of Aristotle and the earliest of his three ethical treatises.

While von Arnim's theory of the development of the *Politics* is interesting and deserves careful consideration, it seems unlikely that his view of the *M.M.* will supersede the current view that it is a compendium of Peripatetic Ethics of the late third or of the second century B.C.

The third study deals with the *Epitome of Peripatetic Ethics* by Arius Didymus, the teacher and friend of the Emperor Augustus. It forms part of his *Ἐπιτομή τῶν ἀρεσκόντων τοῖς φιλοσόφοις*, dealing with the Logic, Physics, and Ethics of the four great schools of philosophy, which has been preserved to us by Stobaeus, the part dealing with Peripatetic Ethics being contained in *Eclog.* II., pp. 116-152 (Wachsmuth).

Von Arnim divides the work into three parts: *A.* General Principles (pp. 116-128), *B.* on ἀρετή and the Virtues (pp. 128-147), *C.* on Economics and Politics (pp. 147-152). Part *A.*, which has been usually held to contain the views of Antiochus—whose lectures at Athens Cicero attended (*de Fin.* V. 1)—represents, according to von Arnim, the doctrine of Theophrastus, and, in particular, is in close harmony with the fragment of Theophrastus *περὶ εὐσεβείας*. Part *B.* descends through Theo-

phrastus from what are, according to von Arnim, the two oldest Aristotelian *Ethics*, the *M.M.* and the *E.E.*; and Part C. descends similarly from the

*Politics* of Aristotle. The evidence which von Arnim adduces for the Theophrastan character of the whole work seems conclusive.

E. S. FORSTER.

#### BAILEY'S EPICURUS.

*Epicurus: The Extant Remains.* With Short Critical Apparatus, Translation and Notes. By CYRIL BAILEY, M.A. Pp. 432. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. 21s. net.

WHAT Mr. Bailey here offers us in this welcome and long-expected book is primarily an edition, including text, translation, and commentary, of the three letters and the collection of maxims preserved in the tenth book of Diogenes Laertius. To this he naturally appends all maxims from the Vatican collection which do not duplicate the others. He follows Bignone in adding, further, to this material a selection of sayings from other sources, eighty-seven in number, nearly all of which are to be found in Usener's *Epicurea*. Lastly, he gives a text and translation, with a brief commentary, of Diogenes' *Life of Epicurus*.

With regard to the textual tradition, Mr. Bailey has nothing new to offer; he relies on the work of his predecessors, especially Usener (1887) and Von der Muehl (Teubner, 1922); and, indeed, on this side there seems to be little more to be done. But the problems of a very difficult text are by no means solved, and Mr. Bailey has used his judgment freely in choosing among the alternatives offered and in making conjectural alterations of his own. His general tendency, like that of all recent editors, is conservative. With the minimum of alteration he nearly always succeeds in producing a text which an unprejudiced reader, aided by the very lucid commentary, will find at least plausible. His own corrections are neat and judicious; perhaps the most striking is his ἀπορρῶ (for ἀπείρῳ) in Ep. I., §47; and an excellent instance of the special strength of his commentary is his treatment of Ep. II., § 98, a difficult passage about day and night, where he uses the Lucretian evidence with excellent effect to support an almost completely satisfactory restoration. On the

other hand, he takes a surprising liberty with the text (alone, I think, among recent editors) by transposing parts of §§ 46, 47, to §§ 61, 62. In this he is following Gassendi, but surely unwisely. The remains of the second book of Epicurus' *περὶ φύσεως*, discovered at Herculaneum, and published more than a hundred years ago, seem to make it certain that these sentences are in place where they originally stood. He also makes what seems to us a quite indefensible transference in Ep. II., § 88. All he does here is to move a relative clause to an earlier position in the complicated and corrupt sentence in which it stands. The sentence as a whole is a definition of κόσμος, and we agree with Usener in thinking that the clause which he moves is itself an independent and complete definition of κόσμος, and therefore probably an *additamentum*. In any case the grammatical results of the transference are deplorable, since a clause introduced by a masculine relative becomes an integral part of a predicate which is feminine both before and after it. We feel bound to register these two complaints; but in general we find Mr. Bailey's treatment of the text judicious and exemplary.

No one who has struggled with the difficulties of these Epicurean texts will be able to refuse a tribute of grateful appreciation to the commentary, which condenses with admirable brevity the thought and works of years on the interpretation of the Greek in close relation to the parallel version offered by Lucretius. Mr. Bailey faces every difficulty of interpretation and does his best to meet it. For those who want to know what Epicurus meant Mr. Bailey's edition will be in the future an invaluable aid. It is necessary, however, to call attention to the strict limitations of Mr. Bailey's achievement, not so much by way of criticism, as in order to remove a possible misapprehension.

When Usener published his *Epicurea* in 1887, he expressly admitted and apologised for the fact that it was not a complete statement of the evidence. For various reasons he was not able to make full use of the treasures of Herculaneum, and in particular he did not venture to touch the fragments of the *περὶ φύσεως* of Epicurus, of which considerable specimens had already been published by Gomperz and other scholars. To-day, forty years later, our editors, Bignone in Italy and now Bailey in England, repeat the *non possumus*. Mr. Bailey does not even cite the published fragments, where relevant, in his Commentary. But, further, during these forty years a succession of German and Italian scholars, many of whose names occur in Mr. Bailey's pages, have been busily at work on the library of Herculaneum. Their work is fragmentary, scattered, laborious, difficult to assess or sum up. Much of it contributes little, through no fault of theirs, to the understanding of Epicureanism. But this large and growing body of work is not without its solid results. It will one day flower, no doubt, into that edition of the *περὶ φύσεως* for which we have so long in vain waited. But even now a treatment of the 'Extant Writings' of Epicurus, which refuses to come to terms with these enquiries, confesses itself in an important sense out-of-date and incomplete.

On this side Mr. Bailey's commentary is a misleading guide, partly because it does not warn the student of its limits, and partly because in the nature of the case it is bound to cross these limits at times, and it crosses them with inadequate information as to the territory which lies beyond. The best way of explaining this would be to go through all Mr. Bailey's citations from the *Volumina Herculaneusia* seriatim. Since this is out of the question, let us select one or two points. In the first place, Mr. Bailey has no standard method of citing these volumes and gives no explanation of what they are. Secondly, he frequently cites from them when he should cite from a modern edition of the papyrus in question. E.g. the passage cited on p. 349 in comment on *Sent.* 3 is from pap. 1012, which Crönert proved

to be by Demetrius Lacon, whose works have been recently edited by De Falco (Naples, 1923). Bailey's *fr.* 83 (p. 138) is from the same papyrus. On p. 344 n. 3 there is a reference to '*Vol. Herc.* col. xv,' which is meaningless. In the App. Crit. to p. 129, '*Vol. Herc.* 176' should be '*Pap. Herc.* 176.' *Fr.* 56 on p. 134 has been shown to belong to Hermarchus, not Epicurus, and should be cited as from Philodemus, *περὶ θεῶν* III. (ed. Diels, 1917). These, of course, like others that could be cited, are all small points, and comparatively unimportant: but they show clearly that Mr. Bailey has not made any systematic use of the evidence furnished by Herculaneum.<sup>1</sup> The danger is that students may be led by his example to think that this evidence may safely be neglected. As against that possible misapprehension it seems advisable to record our opinion that if any important advance is to be made in our knowledge of Epicureanism beyond the present stage, Herculaneum must be its starting-point and base. Mr. Bailey expresses in his Preface the hope that he has 'at least . . . made it clear where the problems lie and what are the data for their solution.' We submit, with respect, that on this side he has not fully succeeded in his aim.

A reviewer inevitably stresses points of disagreement, hoping for a judicious reader in whose mind the true perspective will be restored. Those who are given much will always tend to ask for more. It is certainly much that Mr. Bailey has given us. He has given us the first English edition of an exceptionally interesting and difficult text, and this not as a hurried attempt to fill a gap but as the carefully pondered result of years of study. And if we ask for more, our petition is not that he should change his course or start afresh from Hercu-

<sup>1</sup> An instance of another kind may be added. On Ep. II. 84 (p. 276) Mr. Bailey says that *διαλογισμός*, with its correlates, is not an Epicurean word. In saying this he apparently overlooks *διαλογίσματα* in Ep. I. 68, and *διαλογισμοῖς* in *Sent. Vat.* 10 (= *Metrod. fr.* 37). Cf. also *Epicurea*, *fr.* 138. We have also noted six instances in Philodemus and one in another Epicurean tract from Herculaneum.

May I also add a note of two misprints? P. 130, *fr.* 38, 'φρονίδα' for 'φροντίδα.' P. 268, l. 12 from foot, 'aimed' for 'arrived.'

laneum; only that he shall follow further the path he has marked out for himself, and give us as soon as possible the 'volume of critical essays on the system of Epicurus' which he promises in his

Preface. The only continuous discussion of any length which Mr. Bailey allows himself in his Commentary (on ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας) leads one to expect much light from these.

J. L. STOCKS.

#### REYMOND ON ANCIENT SCIENCE.

*History of the Sciences in Greco-Roman Antiquity.* By ARNOLD REYMOND, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Lausanne. Translated by RUTH GHEURY DE BRAY. Pp. x + 245. 40 diagrams. London: Methuen and Co., 1927. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is a popular sketch of Greek and Roman mathematics and science very much after the type of Heiberg's *Naturwissenschaften und Mathematik im klassischen Altertum* recently translated into English; it is brightly and well written, and should be attractive to intelligent amateurs who are interested in Greek mathematics and science. The book is in two parts, the first of which gives a historical outline, and the second an account of the principles and methods. The second part sets out in greater detail the actual achievements of the ancients in mathematics, mechanics and physics, astronomy, chemistry and other natural sciences. Prefixed is an introduction dealing with what is known of Egyptian and Babylonian mathematics, astronomy, etc. While the modern authorities quoted (chiefly French) are not always quite up to date, the author has a good grip of the subject and a proper appreciation of the essentials; as witness the following remarks about the relation of Greek science to what the Greeks owed to, or could have learnt from, earlier civilisations: 'But it seems probable that the characteristic rationalism of Greek science is proper ["peculiar" would no doubt have been a better translation] to this science; in regard to [*i.e.*, in comparison with] the empirical and fragmentary knowledge of the East, it constitutes a veritable miracle. For the first time, the human mind conceived the possibility of establishing a limited number of principles and of deducing from them a number of truths which are their strict consequence. This achievement, without analogy in the

history of humanity, is all the more astonishing because Greek science, in its first beginnings, had a precarious existence. Not having any influence upon economic life, it could only exist within the schools of philosophy, whose lot and vicissitudes it shared.'

The translation into English seems to be well done, though there are a few slips where it is probably the translation that is at fault, *e.g.*, where it is said of Thales that 'one year, foreseeing an abundant harvest, he rented all the olive trees and thus made a good profit.' Again, *κακοτεχνία* stated by Diogenes Laertius to have been charged (along with *πολυμαθείη*) against Pythagoras by Heraclitus can hardly mean 'art of wickedness' (Diels has 'Künstelei'); Phlius is printed 'Phlias' and Philoponus in French as 'Philipon.' There are some terrible misprints in the few Greek expressions quoted. On the analogy of 'maxima debetur pueris reverentia,' the reader unacquainted with Greek should have been spared the struggle with *πάνιαρεί* as the root-principle of Heraclitus, *σῶς εἰν τά φαινόμενα* as the aim of Greek astronomers, and *ἡμεγίστη* as the Greek original which the Arabs turned into 'Almagest.' It is misleading to write that 'Theophrastus has left us a very valuable book containing the opinions of the ancient natural philosophers' (p. 63)—as if the *φυσικαὶ δόξαι* had survived entire. More serious are some mis-statements of fact. On p. 158 we have descriptions of Euclid's ways of proving his propositions I. 5 and I. 29, which have no resemblance whatever to the actual proofs given by Euclid. On the same page we are told that 'it is thus that Euclid demonstrates the following fact,' the 'following fact' being a proposition which does not occur in Euclid at all. The description (on p. 3) of the Egyptian methods of multiplication and division is quite

inadequate, and may easily convey a wrong impression or no impression; while the statement (p. 80) that the Heronian formula for the area of a triangle in terms of its sides,

$$\Delta = \sqrt{\{p(p-a)(p-b)(p-c)\}},$$

'was probably used by the Egyptian

land-surveyors' is quite gratuitous and has nothing to support it.

I have confined myself to the mathematics because mathematics and astronomy occupy all but a small fraction of the book. The other sciences, and medicine in particular, are less adequately treated.

T. L. HEATH.

#### MAHLOW'S NEUE WEGE.

*Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung.* Sprachgeschichtliche Untersuchungen von GEORG H. MAHLOW, ehem. Direktor des Humboldt-gymnasiums zu Berlin. Pp. viii + 525. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1926. M. 22; bound, M. 25.

THE current opinion about the development of  $\bar{a}$  in Attic is that it has become  $\eta$  except after  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota$  and  $\rho$ , in which positions the development to  $\eta$  has been checked and there has been a return to  $\bar{a}$ . This is put forward as a 'sound-law' and an effort is made to provide special explanations of certain particular cases (such as  $\kappa\eta\eta\eta$ ) which might seem to contradict it. The author of *Neue Wege* (who is well known as the author of *Die langen Vocale A E O in den europäischen Sprachen*) has submitted this opinion to a searching criticism. The admitted exceptions are examined, the explanations hitherto offered are found to be unsatisfactory, and many other exceptions, which have hitherto been passed over in silence, are enumerated. He concludes that the alleged sound-law is no sound-law, since it has a number of real exceptions. On the positive side he decides that Attic is a mixed dialect composed of an  $\bar{a}$ -speech and an  $\bar{e}$ -speech, in other respects identical with one another. The product of this mixture had in each particular case a choice between  $\bar{a}$  and  $\eta$ . The determination of the choice on the one side or the other resulted in a rule (*eine Regel*), viz.,  $\bar{a}$  after  $\epsilon$   $\iota$   $\rho$ ,  $\eta$  elsewhere, with exceptions on both sides. The genesis of the rule is to be sought in one or other (or both) of two directions: one of these is the mysterious way that a language has of creating out of itself an approximation to regularity, by reject-

ing more or less completely whatever does not conform; the other is the influence of individual users of the language, such as famous orators or others (grammarians, etc.) whose verdict on questions of diction carried weight.

The  $\bar{a}$ - and  $\bar{e}$ -speeches which by their mixture gave rise not only to the Attic but also (it is argued) to the other dialects, themselves originated when the Indo-European invaders of the Balkan peninsula and the islands and Asiatic coasts found already there a non-Indo-European population with a highly developed civilisation. The invaders brought with them the  $\bar{a}$  dialect. When the autochthones adopted this they tended to substitute  $\bar{e}$  for  $\bar{a}$ , having no  $\bar{a}$  in their own language.

From this point of view the author of *Neue Wege* re-examines the literary dialects of Greece. He holds that the language of tragedy, including the lyrics, is pure, though archaising, Attic, and that both Solon and Xenophon wrote pure Attic. Hesiod, Tyrtaeus, Pindar, Theognis wrote each in the dialect in which he was accustomed to speak, sometimes exercising a poet's right to prefer the more archaic of two alternative forms, or dropping forms which might have displeased a pan-Hellenic audience. Homer, he believes, wrote in a single dialect which did not contain a single Aeolic or Attic form. He points out that the features which have been selected by grammarians as distinguishing marks of particular dialects are in many cases survivals. Where the old language had a number of alternatives at its disposal, each dialect retained one and dropped the rest. In view of the early date of the Homeric language we must expect to find in it many features, once present in all or most dialects, which were later

selected for retention only by particular dialects, Aeolic or non-Aeolic.

It is hardly possible within the limits of this review to indicate sufficiently the main argument of the book, still less to give an idea of the learning and acumen with which it is developed.

Even if here and there the book provokes dissent, it cannot be denied that many facts which have hitherto been very difficult to understand become, from this new point of view, very easy. It is a work which serious students of Greek cannot afford to neglect.

R. MCKENZIE.

#### PRIMITIVE CULTURE IN ITALY.

*Primitive Culture in Italy.* By H. J. ROSE, M.A. Pp. 253. 8vo. London: Methuen and Co., 1926. 7s. 6d.

IT is some forty years since Andrew Lang startled a world of conservative scholars by suggesting that the Greeks in the heyday of their richest art and civilisation retained rites and ceremonies inherited from a past as uncultivated as that of the Australian aborigines. Professor Rose in his *Primitive Culture in Greece* has carried this idea much further, employing all the improved technique of a later generation, which has the advantage of a wider range of anthropology as well as of several fundamental treatises on early religion. His *Primitive Culture in Italy* is conceived on the same lines and aims at showing that the religion, law, and social organisation of the Italians, in the days of the Republic and even of the Empire, retained many traces and fossilised remains of a state of society which must be inferred to have existed in its completeness fully a thousand years before.

Professor Rose handles his subject with a very sure hand, and shows throughout the most complete mastery of his implements. His use of the scanty archæological evidence is no less dexterous than his analysis of obscure texts; and the resulting conclusions are expressed in a style so simple and direct that the immense labour underlying them might almost escape the notice of an inexperienced reader. The introductory chapter outlines the main workings of the savage mind and suggests the nature of *mana*, a sort of electricity in the spiritual atmosphere, as the key to his religious thought and practice. From this the author passes to a review of the little that is known as to the several races and cultures found in

Italy from the Stone Age onwards. He excludes from his treatment everything that is due to Greek or Etruscan, as being of foreign importation, and tries to get down to the rock-bed of the uncontaminated Italian. This, of course, is a much wider term than the merely Roman; it includes several individual elements, in more or less distinct strata, which are perceptible even as early as a thousand years before Christ.

These questions of 'race, religion, and culture' lead up to a chapter on the gods, which is a masterpiece of brief exposition, worthy of a pupil of Warde Fowler, to whom the volume is very appropriately dedicated. The author brings out clearly in a few paragraphs the curiously episodic character of the Italian deities, who are 'not so much gods as particular manifestations of *mana*.' Such are the destroying fire, the striking weapon, the fever (I should like to question its being malarial fever), or the rust in the wheat. These are contrasted with the very different gods of the classical authors, all borrowed from the Greek. 'The Roman cult was essentially polydaimonism.' As an explanation of the forms of worship and sacrifice it is shown that the Romans could and did bargain with their gods, and expect them to honour the contract. Incidentally here and in many other places the editor of Plutarch's 'Roman Questions' makes good use of his own earlier work. Two chapters on 'Worship and Magic' explain the origin and use of such terms as *lustratio*, *ambarvalia*, *carmina*—whence we derive the word 'charms'—as well as the significance of the *Equirria*, *agonium Martiale*, *tubilustrum*, and other ceremonies associated with the seasonal activities of agriculture and war. A chapter on 'tabus, priests and kings' contains many interesting

remarks about the flamen, and it is to be noted that Professor Rose is not a convert to the theory of priest-kings in Italy. Births and marriages with their several rites are treated under the heading of 'exits and entrances,' suggested by Van Gennep's 'Rites de Passage'; the same chapter has a valuable dissertation on the meaning of 'genius.' At every step the discussions are illustrated by apt references to the beliefs and customs of savage peoples, ranging from Ashanti to New Guinea. Wisely avoiding an excessive multiplication of instances the author cites enough to substantiate his thesis that 'that great people who taught the rest of Europe what codes and statutes meant had in its early days to pass through a state very like that of the savage in regard to law.' The three chapters dealing respectively with 'Family and Clan,' 'Crimes and Torts,' 'Property, Public Opinion, and Status,' cover ground which is rather more familiar to most students, but bring out some valuable details, notably in regard to the punishment of parricides. The use of public opinion is amusingly demonstrated from a provision of the Twelve Tables, according to which a suitor who could not bring witnesses to prove a debt had the privilege of going

every day to his alleged debtor's door and howling at him.

In his concluding chapter the author emphasises some 'negative considerations,' such as the absence of any indigenous art or literature or philosophy, no less than the backward character of trade and industry, as showing that the early Italians, apart from Greek or Etruscan influence, were far from being a fully civilised people. As a broad generalisation this conclusion seems to be justified, though a slight mitigation of the judgment may be urged by the archæologist, who sees new evidence constantly appearing of a material culture higher than has hitherto been suspected. The little-known peoples of the east coast, Picenes and Apulians, are beginning to appear as important factors with a remarkable amount of character and originality. But we can hardly hope to recover much knowledge of their beliefs or social organisation, so that Professor Rose's judgment cannot be seriously challenged on this ground. Perhaps, however, some evidence may be adduced that trade was more important and more highly organised in the native Italian communities than his statement would suggest.

D. RANDALL-MACIVER.

#### A FRENCH COMMENTARY ON LUCRETIVS

*Lucretius: De Rerum Natura.* Commentaire exégétique et critique. Tome premier. Livres I. et II. Par ALFRED ERNOUT ET LÉON ROBIN. Pp. cxiii + 369. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925.<sup>1</sup> M. ERNOUT has already given us his text and translation of Lucretius, and it might perhaps have been thought that there was hardly room for another full commentary. But this first instalment (Books I. and II.) fully justifies itself. Both M. Ernout and his colleague, Professor Robin, who joins him in the commentary, have a specific contribution to make, and the result is undoubtedly an addition to our knowledge and understanding of Lucretius. M. Ernout's main interest, as he had

already shown in his earlier edition of Book IV., is philological, grammatical, and linguistic; M. Robin's is in the history and exegesis of Greek philosophy; on both these sides the present edition contains interesting and important work.

The Introduction (by M. Ernout) is mainly concerned with the style and language of Lucretius, and besides gathering together much interesting material it has some original suggestions. He notices, for instance, that such licences as the use of the genitive singular in *-ai*, and the genitive plural of the second declension in *-um*, occur almost entirely in passages which are archaic and epic in tone, and that the suppression of the final *s* appears mainly in 'forced prosodies' in the awkward places at the end of the line: these are evidences of deliberate archaism on the

<sup>1</sup> The reviewer is not responsible for the delay in the appearance of this review.—Edd. C.R.

poet's part. The section on language, M. Ernout's speciality, is of great value, that on Lucretius' metrical system interesting, but it does not touch the problem, which is surely of first-class importance for the understanding of Lucretius' metre, of the relation of scansion by quantity to the stress-accent.

The Introduction is followed by a translation by M. Ernout of the three letters and *Κύρια Δόξαι* of Epicurus with a few critical notes in places where he differs from Usener. This is a valuable feature, and illustrates the modern tendency of all critics of Lucretius to get back to Epicurus. As regards the text, I note with pleasure that M. Ernout has hit upon *ἰσχυρόν τι*, as I had myself, in § 41: in § 66, *ἐγκαταχθεμένων* for the MS. *ἐγκατεχόμενων* is a valuable suggestion, and so is <ἐν> *αὐτοῖς* in a difficult passage in § 68. The translation is free, it splits up sentences, and paraphrases a good deal, so that at times it is hardly accurate, and at others very difficult to understand without explanatory notes. But it is doubtless intended primarily to convey the general sense to a French reader, and in this it succeeds admirably: it is certainly far more graceful and less crabbed than the original Greek. M. Ernout has made considerable use of von der Mühl's text, but in my view not enough of the work of the Italians, of Giussani, and in particular of Bignone.

The Commentary itself certainly makes a substantial contribution to the criticism of Lucretius, and presents some new features. M. Robin, in his philosophical notes, brings to bear on Lucretius a knowledge not only of Epicurus and the earlier atomists, but of the general trend of Greek scientific speculation from Thales to the Stoics. His notes, which are wonderfully succinct and lucid, are therefore nearly always illuminating: specially worthy of study are those on the conception of the void (I. 329), on the theory of *ἀντιπερίστασις* (I. 372), on the relation of the Stoics to Heraclitus (I. 635), on the vexed question of 'weight' in the system of Democritus (II. 83), on the *clinamen* (II. 216), and on *ἐπιβολή τῆς*

*διαβολίας* (= *animi iniectus*, II. 739), though in the last M. Robin seems to me hardly to realise distinctly enough the parallel Epicurean conception of the *ἐπιβολή τῶν αἰσθητηρίων*. I should, however, doubt his view that *sensus communis* (I. 422) is equivalent to 'touch,' nor in I. 449 is it easy after *his coniuncta duabus rebus* (sc. the atoms and the void) to believe that Lucretius was thinking primarily of compound bodies, or to accept the position that in reference to the void the distinction between *coniuncta* and *eventa* would be meaningless.

M. Ernout, who is responsible for the great bulk of the notes, has thrown a flood of light on matters philological, linguistic, and metrical: one might cite as specimens the notes on *daedala* (I. 7), *dias* (I. 22), substantives in *-men* (I. 284), *tempore puncto* (II. 263), which he takes to mean 'in time considered as a point,' and on *caeruleum*=*lapis lazuli*, which the editor preserves as against the common emendation *curalium* in II. 805. The weak point in the commentary seems to me to be that certain departments of criticism—notably that of the text and the elucidation of difficult passages—slip between the two editors. M. Ernout has no doubt in the critical apparatus to his edition of the text already given us some brief indications of his preferences. But in the commentary his procedure seems rather arbitrary: sometimes there is a full discussion of a textual difficulty, sometimes a rather high-handed assumption of the superiority of the reading of his choice (e.g., *crescentes*, I. 190), sometimes—and this is perhaps the most serious deficiency—no discussion at all of a well-known textual difficulty (e.g., I. 404, *ferai* or *ferarum*; I. 433, *aliquid* or *aliquo*, and the order of the lines; II. 289, *mens* or *res*; II. 42-43, where the famous *cruces* can hardly be dismissed with the statement that O writes the lines in red and Q omits them). Similarly, there are passages which do not by any philosophical difficulty involve the intervention of M. Robin, but do require interpretation and have been very variously taken, on which M. Ernout is silent. Such are I. 551 ff., a passage

which Giussani has done much to illuminate; II. 167, *ignari materiai*; II. 454-5, a very difficult place: what does M. Ernout take to be the meaning of *papaveris haustus*?

It may be worth while to note a few misprints in an excellently produced volume: p. 8, *πόντου πλά* (*πλάκα*); p. 86, *Lucretium* for *Lucretius*; p. 112, *intatile* (*intactile*); p. 143, *pro diuom corbora* (for *numina*) *sancta*; p. 270,

*quea* (*quae*); p. 279, Murno (Munro); p. 348, *sunt* (*sint*); p. 350, *achèvement*.

I have called attention to what seem to me some blemishes, but should like to say, in conclusion, that the edition is of real value. M. Ernout and M. Robin have shown that in spite of all that has been done there was more to be said about Lucretius, and they have said it well. We shall look forward to the later volumes. CYRIL BAILEY.

#### DESSAU'S HISTORY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

*Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit.* Von HERMANN DESSAU. Zweiter Band, erste Abteilung. Die Kaiser von Tiberius bis Vitellius. Pp. viii+400. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926. 14 M.

THIS half-volume carries the history down to the end of A.D. 69. The second part of Vol. II. (which is in the press) will review the condition of Italy and the provinces during the first century of the Empire, and two further volumes will continue the narrative down to the Council of Nicæa. A preface is now supplied: the author's purpose is to meet a widespread demand for an up-to-date history, and his aim is to set forth clearly what is known, implicitly or explicitly rejecting erroneous statements which may be recommended by the name or standing of their authors, or may dazzle by their boldness. Such a critical attitude is needed at the present time. In reviewing Vol. I. (C.R. XXXVIII. 190 ff.), we spoke of the disappointingly sparing use of references: the preface explains that they are given only when the sources lie off the track, or have recently come to light, or for other reasons may not be generally known. In the present half-volume this rule does not seem to be strictly observed, but the reader will be the better pleased: on the whole the documentation is adequate, and room is found for the criticism of views which are doubted or rejected.

Prudent conservatism, scholarly accuracy, and balanced judgment combine to give Dessau's exposition an enduring value. As space is severely limited, we can only review some of its more interesting features. No brief is held for

Tiberius as monarch: despite extenuating circumstances, he is a sinister figure; and in this connexion (as in others) Tacitus is warmly defended, although certain defects are admitted, and especially one noted by Boissier, that of yielding to the desire for effect, particularly at the close of sections, a defect born of the practice of giving public readings before publication. This is how we should regard the notorious parting summary of Tiberius' character—a view which is surely nearer the truth than that which sees in it Tacitus' 'most deliberate judgment on Tiberius.' That Caligula was no madman Dessau rightly insists, but he accepts the traditional account of his expedition to the North, with only a trifling discount which does not include the tale about the prisoners: yet the repetition of the story in the case of Domitian hardly adds credibility to it. Claudius, it seems to us, gets less than justice. Great reluctance is shown to give him credit for anything. The new harbour at Ostia was probably not his idea, though it is admitted that he took a special interest in it (pp. 154, 187). The invasion of Britain was certainly due to his advisers, who saw that their helpless chief must win some military glory and secure the loyalty of the army. Such glory could be won cheaply in Britain, but there was no inclination to venture on an aggressive policy where it would have been justifiable: Corbulo was recalled from beyond the Rhine, and thereby 'a wrong was done to a distinguished man' (p. 190). One feature of the reign, the promotion of Romanisation, it would not be easy to ascribe to the influence of others; but it was not

difficult to advance along the lines indicated by Augustus, 'die Eigenart des Kaisers, seine persönliche Schwäche und seine Schrullen, haben hier nicht gestört.' One feels that Dessau has been too much influenced by the extant speech about the Gallic chiefs. 'Da sehen wir den Mann, wie er leibt und lebt': this silly speech is a self-revelation which justifies the picture of Tacitus, and who will blame the historian for disdaining to reproduce it even in abstract? No doubt it was a poor effort, but we should not forget that we do not possess the historian's account of Claudius' earlier years, and that Tacitus himself says: *nec in Claudio quotiens meditata dissereret, elegantiam requireres*. Moreover, it is admitted in an Addendum (p. 400) that the recently discovered Letter of the Emperor cannot be convicted of anything worse than 'eine bedenkliche Neigung zur Geschwätzigkeit.' In any case, a man may be a poor stylist without being an absolute fool. Another marked feature of the reign, the development of bureaucracy, deserves a fuller account than it receives.

A long chapter on Nero contains a good deal that merits attention. Seneca is, with good reason, torn down from the pedestal of saintliness on which his fine moral sermons have led so many to set him: the unknown admirer who joined his bust with that of Socrates was placing the impure side by side with the pure. The first conflict between Christianity and the government had no direct consequences; the next collisions, some decades later, were of an essentially different kind. On this subject we must await the fuller exposi-

tion which the next volume will doubtless contain; but Dessau is, we think, right in disbelieving Ed. Meyer's view that the government of the time appreciated the peculiar character of the Christian religion and its danger to the State. About Nero's *Orientpolitik* we have recently been hearing, perhaps, more than enough: Dessau declines to take his sudden plans of conquest very seriously, and scorns the notion that the mantle of Alexander had fallen on him. Our old friend the *quinquennium* appears in his old garb, with the comment that Trajan's judgment need not be decisive for us; but the judgment is incompletely, and therefore incorrectly, reported.

The events leading to, and following on, Nero's fall are well described. The theory of 'The Last Battle of the Roman Republic' is rightly rejected. In the military narrative of Tacitus' *Histories* there are few faults to be found, though in a couple of places errors are reproduced from his sources. One of them is the statement about the *confluentes Padi et Adnae*, which is 'obviously a misconception': Hardy's correction *Adrae* is not approved, and it certainly seems unlikely that a junction on the south side of the Po could be fixed as the objective. It may be added that reasons are given for doubting the correctness of Mattingly's 'brilliant conjecture' that the unique denarius with the legends *Legion. XV. Primig.* and *Adsertor Libertatis* is a memorial of the fall of Veters.

We have noticed some typographical errors and one or two small slips which need not be enumerated.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

### THREE BOOKS ON SYNTAX.

*Système de la Syntaxe Latine.* By A. C. JURET. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg.) Pp. 1-428. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres' (London: Milford), 1926. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.

*Syntaxe Latine.* Par O. RIEMANN. Seventh edition, revised by A. ERNOUT. Pp. 1-697. Paris: Klincksieck, 1927. Cloth, 36 fr.

*Studi sul Significato Fondamentale dell'*

*Accusativo.* By M. BARONE. Pp. 1-140. Rome: Befani, 1926. Paper, 20 lire.

It would be difficult to conceive a more bewildering method of treatment of a language than that of M. Juret. The book has three main sections: (1) Expression de l'affirmation, (2) détermination de l'affirmation, (3) propositions déterminant l'affirmation; and this psychological or metaphysical

classification is developed in an interminable series of sub- and sub-subdivisions. So much space is required for 'système' that comparatively little is left for 'syntaxe'; the mere 'table des matières' occupies twenty closely-printed pages. And all this elaborate machinery throws comparatively little light on Latin itself: it is a scheme of thought and expression into which, without serious alteration, might be fitted the analysis of almost any highly developed language. It is, perhaps, only to be expected that the application of this intricate 'système' should be mechanical: at times it is unbelievably so. P. 43, side by side with the familiar *fuimus Troes*, as an example of the perfect, 'indiquant que cet état n'existe plus,' we find *haec permanserunt aquae dies complures* (Caes. B. Civ. I. 50 § 1). Caesar apparently wishes to assure his readers that they need not hesitate to visit Ilerda, as the rain has stopped! And in the same paragraph is quoted, as illustrating the two forms of 'perfect passive'—viz., with 'sum' and 'fui'—*omnia quae sunt conclusa nunc artibus, dispersa et dissipata quondam fuerunt* (Cic. De Or. I. 187): are either of these 'perfect passives' in any reasonable sense of the term?

P. 72. Side by side with perfect participle passive, future participle active and gerundive as predicates with *sum*, is given this example of a present participle—*ea quae conservantia sunt huius status* (Cic. Fin. III. 5. 16). 'conservantia', as the dependent genitive shows, is logically and grammatically an adjective.

Pp. 96-99. Three whole pages are devoted to *se* and *suus*; they contain not a little loose thinking, or loose expression—e.g., p. 99: 'Quoique, dans une subordonnée qui exprime la pensée du sujet de la principale, le réfléchi puisse toujours renvoyer au sujet de la subordonnée, quelquefois il y est remplacé par *is*, sans doute afin d'éviter une équivoque possible'; e.g., *Helvetii persuadent Rauracis uti una cum iis profisciscantur*. Here one observes (1) that *iis* refers to subject of principal clause, so that the example does not illustrate the rule; (2) that no ambiguity is possible; (3) that *iis* does not lessen any possible ambiguity; (4) the real explanation of

*iis*—viz., that an intervening ablative absolute has shifted the point of view from the Helvetii to the Rauraci—is concealed by the shortening of the quotation. The real 'inwardness,' the psychology, of *se* and *suus* is sacrificed to a barren and meaningless classification. M. Juret translates *Paetus omnes libros quos frater suus reliquisset mihi donavit* by 'tous les livres qu'il pensait que son frère lui avait laissés'! Surely both *suus* and *reliquisset* make it Paetus' definition of the gift, not Cicero's. No room is found in this section for the compound adjective *suus quisque*, as in Virg. Ecl. VII. 54: *strata iacent passim sua quaeque sub arbore poma*.

P. 233. 'De+ablative,' as a variant of the instrumental ablative, has a paragraph to itself—e.g., *sua de materia grandescere* (Lucr. I. 191); then, in a separate group, *non-classiques*—*praebere cibum proprio de corpore* (Lucr. III. 991). What connexion has either of these with an instrumental ablative, and why, if Lucr. I. is classical, is Lucr. III. non-classical?

P. 316. *Quod castra movisset, factum inopia pabuli* (Caes. B.G. VII. 20) occurs among a group of 'quod+indicative' clauses without any indication that *factum* stands for *factum esse* (O.O.).

P. 342. *Circumfunduntur hostes, si quem aditum reperire possent* (Caes. B.G. VI. 37) is not classed with *expectabam si quid scriberes* (Cic. Att. XVI. 2. 4) of the preceding paragraph, but with *neque Herculi quisquam decumam vovit unquam, si sapiens factus esset* (Cic. N.D. III. 88), which is surely a very thinly disguised O.O. construction.

P. 345. *Quasi vero tu sis ab illis, Sallusti, ortus: quod si esses, non nullos iam tuae turpitudinis pigeret* (Sallust: attributed to Cicero): 'l'opposition entre *quasi* + subj. parfait et *quod si* esses montre que *quasi* avec le subj. présent ou parfait n'exprime pas l'irréel, mais s'y oppose.' Is *sis* . . . *ortus* a perfect subjunctive, and does not *quod si* esses following *quasi* . . . *sis* show rather the opposite of what M. Juret suggests? Here, again, he makes no attempt to account for the use of present subjunctive with 'quasi,' which, though regular, is a surprising idiom.

P. 372. In the discussion of *cum* causal with indicative no mention is made of the colloquial *cum* with indicative after such verbs as *laudo*, *gaudeo*, *gratulor*.

P. 375. Examples are given of *dum* and *donec* with subjunctive 'exprimant une circonstance explicative': *dum se rex totus avertisset, alter elatam securim in caput deiecit* (Liv. I. 40. 7) [here, if the reading is sound, *dum* must imply 'waiting until']; *illa dum te fugeret praeceps, hydrum non vidit* (Virg. Georg. IV. 457) [where *dum* must mean 'in her effort to escape']. The only use of *dum* that can properly be called 'causal' is with the present indicative. No suggestion is made that *dum*, with the subjunctive, expresses a time calculation in the mind of the subject of the sentence, not of the writer. Again the classification is mechanical, with no attempt at logical analysis.

Diligence and learning are self-evident in this book, but appreciative judgment is sadly to seek.

Riemann's *Syntaxe Latine*, originally published in 1886, went through two editions under his own hand; the next four, 1894-1920, were revised by Paul Lejay. This is the first revision under the hand of the present editor. The additions and modifications in this edition are very slight—an occasional 'aside,' strengthening or modifying the expression of a rule; thus, on p. 223, the suggestion is made that the gradual replacement of deponent by active forms of the same verb had its origin in popular speech. P. 397, Remarque IV.: A short paragraph is inserted discussing conditional sentences in which tense or mood are not in harmony as between principal and subordinate clause. It is amazing if the subject was not touched on in an earlier edition, and equally amazing that half a page should be considered adequate. Nor is the new editor very felicitous here—e.g., Virg. Georg. 4. 116, *ni iam . . . vela traham . . . forsitan et canerem*. The present subjunctive *traham* is explained as emphasising the actuality of *traho*; but surely the very way to emphasise the actuality of *traho* is to say *ni traherem*. Equally questionable in the same paragraph is the analysis of Cic. Div. II. 22, *an Cn.*

*Pompeium censes laetaturum fuisse, si sciret se trucidatum iri: scisset*, he says, 'indiquerait qu'il avait su et qu'il ne savait pas.' Here a terrible confusion is admitted by the disregard of the negative (*non sciebat*) implied in *si sciret*: *si scisset* would imply *nesciit*, *si sciret* implies *nesciebat*—a 'state of mind' in the past as contrasted with a 'past act.' This Grammar of Riemann's is one of the few that draw attention to a very interesting use of the imperfect indicative, that many must have observed in their reading, to express 'what was bound to happen' or 'likely to happen': Cic. Pro Milone 32, *Milone interfecto Clodius haec assequatur* (= 'stood to gain'); Livy, 21. 5. 3, *quibus oppugnantis quia haud dubie Romana arma movebantur* (an attack on Saguntum meant war with Rome). So in Greek, Eur. Heracl. 1004: *τοιαῦτα δρῶντι τὰμ' ἐγγύς ἄσφαλῃ* (= 'seemed likely to be secured'). Riemann is quite sound on the use of the indicative of *possum*, *debeo*, in the principal clause of a conditional sentence whose *si* clause is in the subjunctive, but neither here nor in his larger *Comparative Syntax of Greek and Latin* does he make it quite clear that the imperfect of these verbs, like *ἔδει*, *εἰκός ἦν* and the like in Greek, may and often does refer to 'an unfulfilled duty in the present.' It seems very doubtful whether he recognises this idiom, for in his *Comparative Syntax* (p. 302) he quotes next to each other: Cic. De Nat. Deorum III. 79, *debebant illi quidem omnes bonos efficere, si quidem hominum generi consulebant* (which clearly refers to the past, as *si consulebant* shows); and Cic. De Div. II. 91, *oculorum fallacissimo sensu iudicant ea, quae ratione atque animo videre debebant* (which equally clearly refers to the present). The edition is a model of clearness in arrangement, exposition, and printing.

The author of the third treatise follows the French scholar Bréal in defining the fundamental use of the accusative in Greek and Latin as the expression of 'motion towards.' By 'fundamental' he is careful to observe that he does not mean 'logically essential,' but 'historically primary.' To illustrate his method of accounting for the other uses of the accusative, one example will suffice—

the accusative of the direct object. Here the process is simple: expand 'movement' into 'activity' and you have your 'accusative of the object' as the 'immediate direction of the verbal

action.' The exposition of the theory is temperate and well-reasoned; but so many of these propositions look almost as well the other way round.

H. WILLIAMSON.

*The Twilight of History.* By D. G. HOGARTH. Pp. 19. London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1926. 1s.

THE author of this pamphlet with his customary eloquence suggests that we are doing our records an injustice when we believe that the fall of the Mycenaean world was followed by a period of barbarism and decay of culture. Instead of the Dark Ages he would have us call this period a 'Twilight,' by which he means the half-light before the dawn. He elaborates the theory that the artist class fades and the artisan class flourishes in all periods of democratic revival that follow the expulsion or fall of dynasties and despots. His evidence is found in the improvement of technique but decay of artistic quality in vases of the period that follows the destruction of Knossos in the fifteenth century B.C. Applying this theory as a law to the period between 1000 and 800 he argues that the quality of the pottery then made indicates a strong democratic revival, continuous from the democracy that followed from the fall of Knossos, and he tries to diminish the catastrophic character of the Dorian invasion, repudiating the view often held that it was followed by a 'winter of discontent' and relative anarchy. He suggests that the Dorian invasion was as little catastrophic as the Cimmerian invasion of Asia or the inroad of the Galatians into Anatolia.

Criticisms of such wide generalisations are as difficult as they are necessary. Ceramic evidence often gives a precarious foothold, particularly when it is used as a basis for political inference, and to elaborate a law about artisans and artists from such slender premises is risky, if attractive. Nor does the thesis about the Dorian invasion appear tenable, for there is no analogy between the Dorian inroad and those of the Galatians and Cimmerians. The Dorians, armed with the most efficient weapons hitherto produced, invaded a land that was virtually defenceless. That they brought about a catastrophe in nearly every Mycenaean town is evident from the remains. Cimmerians and Galatians were merely roaming bands of warriors, not unlike the mediaeval Catalan bands, who created local disturbances but never aimed at or achieved the complete control of the countries they invaded.

The spade-work has yet to be done on the 'Dark Ages' before we can be in a position to generalise and to say whether the glimmer in the sky was in the east or in the west. Perhaps twenty years hence we shall know more clearly.

S. CASSON.

*Homer and his Influence.* By JOHN A. SCOTT. London: George Harrap, 1926. 5s. net. ANYONE who has tried to write for this series, 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome,' knows how

difficult is the task. If we are somewhat disappointed by Mr. Scott's essay, it is not because it falls below the normal level of the series, but because his admirable *Unity of Homer* made us pitch our expectations high. We hoped that, like Mr. Mackail in his excellent book on Virgil, Mr. Scott would give us a simple and straightforward appreciation of his author as a story-teller and poet. It looks as if he had been deflected from this purpose by the ghost of the Homeric controversy. He makes a conscientious effort to cram into his narrow space more matter than it will properly hold. He has collected a mass of heterogeneous material, interesting and trivial, and has thrown it together with a nervous haste which makes the effect jerky and unconvincing. He touches first on the Homeric question, too lightly for effective argument, then on Homer's use of traditional matter, then on the merits of various English versions, and so, leaping from theme to theme, fills three chapters, more than a fifth of the book, with strictly irrelevant matter, before he comes to the *Iliad* itself. When he does, he finds no room for 'a discussion of the plot and the great scenes,' but decides to 'illustrate the poet's ability to set forth striking ideas in a few words' by a 'series of brief quotations and running comments.' The book improves as it goes on. There is, for instance, an amusing chapter on Proteus, and the many forms he has assumed in the hands of modern poets and journalists. From time to time, shrewd and humorous observations relieve monotony, and remind us that the author, though he is not perhaps Mr. Scott in his happiest vein, is still Mr. Scott.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

*Themis. A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion.* By JANE ELLEN HARRISON. Second edition, revised. Pp. xxxvi + 559. Cambridge: University Press. 21s.

THIS edition is practically a reprint, with a new and characteristic Preface, and some few notes at the end of almost every chapter, containing corrections and references to recent publications—among them the writer's own *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, in which she indicated some slight modifications of her earlier views. Professor Gilbert Murray has inserted in his excursus to Chapter VIII, 'On the Ritual Forms preserved in Greek Tragedy,' a few paragraphs based on the statements of Herodotus with regard to the relation of Dionysus to Osiris. Some of the illustrations do not come out quite so clearly in this edition as in the first, though they are quite adequate for their purpose.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

*The Religion of Ancient Greece.* An outline by THADDAEUS ZIELINSKI. Translated from the Polish with the author's co-operation by GEORGE RAPALL NOYES. Pp. x+235. Oxford University Press, 1926. 7s. 6d.

THE French translation of this pleasant but disappointing book was noticed in *C.R.* XL, p. 215. The opinion I then expressed appears to be shared by Professor Rose, *J.H.S.* XLVI, p. 264 and *Year's Work*, 1926, p. 54. The English translation reads as though it were well done. It lacks the notes and bibliography of the French version, but, on the other hand, it has an index, which the French has not.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

*De dis Atticis Priapi similibus.* HANS HERTER. Pp. 64. Bonn: Scheur, 1926.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation, part of a longer work on Priapos and similar deities which the author hopes to publish later. It collects in an adequate manner what little is known of this group of deities (Orphanes, Konisalos, Tychon, Phales or Ithyphallos, Hilaon, Aphroditos), and comments on their cult and nature sensibly enough. The author maintains against Farnell the obscene nature of the allusions in Plato Comicus, fr. 174, Kock (Athen. X, 441E), on p. 11; on p. 39 he sides with those who disagree with Usener concerning the alleged identity of St. Tychon and the daimon of that name; on p. 47 he commits himself, in discussing Phales, to the rather doubtful statement, *phallus . . . a principio haud dubie Bacchi ipsius signum fuit, paulatim autem peculiaris deus factus*. A useful little work.

H. J. ROSE.

*Prehistoric Aigina.* A History of the Island in the Bronze Age. By JAMES PENROSE HARLAND. Pp. xii+122. Paris: Champion, 1925.

THIS booklet is to some extent a supplement to the author's *Peloponnesos in the Bronze Age*, and deals only with Aegina, which may be called an offshoot of the Morea. He describes first the archaeological evidence, which has been considerably increased by the Bavarian excavations of Furtwängler, recently resumed by Professor Wolters, so pending full publication of their results the conclusions drawn from them are provisional. He proceeds to discuss the various legends about early Aegina, its inhabitants and their provenance, and pronounces against Furtwängler's theory as to a Cretan colony at the Aphaia site, for which there is no real evidence. He formulates his ideas in the form of a creed, which is in the main reasonable. Aegina at the beginning of the Bronze Age (Early Helladic Period) was occupied by a people akin to the inhabitants of the Cyclades and south-western Asia Minor, who probably spoke a non-Indo-European language. With the Middle Helladic Period came the first invaders from the North—Indo-Europeans who used 'Minyan ware,' worshipped Poseidon, and soon fell under the influence of Minoan civilisation. Then about 1400 B.C. came the next wave of Northerners, 'Achaeans,' speaking proto-Doric—really a

people of the North-West dialect group, who brought with them Zeus Hellenios. The author regards the Aeacid house as Thessalian, and gives the Spercheios Valley, which was the realm of Peleus and Achilles, to Thessaly, though the archaeological evidence hardly justifies so close a connexion. The myths, however, certainly link the Spercheios Valley with Aegina, but, as Aeacus was Peleus' father, might well point to his moving north from Aegina rather than *vice versa*.

Still the origin of Minyan ware is the problem, and when this is solved we shall have made a great advance towards understanding the early ethnology of Greece. The author is probably right in regarding Aegina as one centre of manufacture of the Minyan and matt-painted wares, and not as the sole source of the latter.

A. J. B. WACE.

*Antike Schlachtfelder, Bausteine zu einer Antiken Kriegsgeschichte.* Vol. IV. Part 2. J. KROMAYER and G. VEITH. Pp. 171-323. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926. *Schlachten-Atlas zur Antiken Kriegsgeschichte, Griechische Abteilung I. Von Marathon bis Chaeroneia.* J. KROMAYER and G. VEITH. Leipzig: H. Wagner and E. Debes, 1926.

THESE most recent volumes of two well-known works follow the lines of their predecessors, which need not be described. The first volume of *Schlachtfelder* appeared in 1903; the Atlas is a much more recent undertaking. The two supplement each other, and the full value of this is now made clear for the first time by the appearance of a volume of each work dealing with the same battles, and with cross-references from one to the other.

Part 2 of Vol. IV. of *Schlachtfelder* deals mainly with the Peloponnesian War, and the fourth century down to 361. It will be remembered that Vol. I. began with Epaminondas, and Vol. IV. has now overlapped Vol. I.; it is indeed in part a new edition of Vol. I., as Kromayer has revised his views on Mantinea, and Mantinea is now dealt with for the second time. Six different authors contribute to the new volume. This is a gain from the point of view of technical knowledge, but like the curious distribution of the subjects among volumes it rather spoils the symmetry. Kromayer himself and Lehmann-Haupt, for instance, have different views as to the nature of a parasang, and both argue for their views at length in this same volume. But *Schlachtfelder* is to be regarded less as a connected work than as a collection of material for a history of ancient war. This purpose it continues to serve admirably. Ancient battles will never be reconstructed with any certainty, but the methods adopted by Kromayer and imposed by him on his collaborators get as near to the truth as it is possible to get. His method is to allow more or less equal weight to literary tradition, topography, and common sense. He avoids at once the Sherlock-Holmes-like ingenuity of most English writers on this subject, and the cocksureness of many foreign writers.

In the new volume Kromayer's fresh treat-

ment of Mantinea is of especial interest. So are the geographical investigations connected with Xenophon's and Agesilaus' movements in Asia. It is disappointing that there is still nothing to be said about the obscure warfare of the Pentekontaetia, and that we are not given a full discussion of the operations at Syracuse.

The new volume of the Atlas provides an admirable aid to the study of the book. Particularly admirable are the short summaries of matters discussed fully in the book. English readers who have a special affection for the Persian Wars will find that the summaries of Marathon and the other classic battles are models of common sense.

The Atlas contains a notification of the murder of Colonel Veith, the joint author, near Zela, where he was collecting topographical material for a later volume of the Atlas. His is a severe loss. He understood so well the use both of the sword and the pen, that he was particularly qualified for this kind of work, and brought sanity to many an academic battlefield.

N. WHATLEY.

*L'impero ateniese.* By A. FERRABINO. Pp. 470. Turin: Bocca, 1927. 58 lire.

UNDER this misleading title Mr. Ferrabino has written a history of the Peloponnesian War, devoid of controversial detail, but too replete with the narrative of military events to leave much room for the discussion of the Athenian empire. This arrangement of material is the more to be regretted, as the author displays no special interest in problems of strategy—Dr. Grundy's *Thucydides* is apparently unknown to him—while, on the other hand, he throws out many theories on Athenian politics which need a good deal of justification, but do not receive it. Beginning abruptly with the siege of Samos, Mr. Ferrabino proceeds to a good and careful analysis of the events preceding the war, in which Pericles no less than Archidamus is characterised as an essentially pacific statesman, yet he concludes that Pericles forced on the conflict in order to escape from some trivial contretemps in his domestic politics. For the new alignment of the Greek states in 421-0 B.C. he finds the key in the antagonism between democrats at Argos and oligarchs in Boeotia. In his account of the Melian and Sicilian expeditions he makes Nicias go arm in arm with Alcibiades, and interprets his reluctance to the latter enterprise as an artful piece of coquetry. In the affair of the Four Hundred he promotes Peisander to the position of prime instigator, and conflates Aristotle's two constitutions, the 'Provisorium' and the 'Definitivum,' into a single act. He represents the execution of the six generals in 406 B.C. as a victory of an oligarchic group in the Boule over a more humane or scrupulous Ecclesia. These and similar paradoxes may perhaps be capable of proof, but the rather curt arguments on which they are made to rest are scarcely sufficient to make us abandon Thucydides and Xenophon in their favour.

Mr. Ferrabino spares a few pages for some interesting observations on literature and econo-

mics. In the field of economics he is somewhat free in the use of new modern concepts; in particular, he draws a sharp distinction between 'imprendenti' and 'risparmiatori,' which belongs to recent rather than to ancient history. But his analyses of labour and money conditions are often shrewd and well worth following up. He startles us by degrading Aristophanes into a mere cynic, but on the *Oedipus Coloneus* and the *Bacchae* he pronounces a more felicitous judgment: 'Sofocle nasconde il dolore tra fumi d' incenso; a Euripide anche il balsamo è amaro.'

M. CARY.

*De Orationibus quae sunt in Xenophontis Hellenicis.* By ELISABETH VORRENHAGEN. Pp. 143. Elberfeld: Karl Rheinen, 1926.

THE industrious lady who has penned this dissertation on the *Hellenica* of Xenophon gives a list of no less than seventy authorities which she has consulted; and of these the only English name is Jebb—alas for the nakedness of the land! Among Continental scholars, it appears, there has been of late a lively controversy concerning the composition of the *Hellenica*. Did Xenophon write it all straightway or at considerable intervals, 'here a little and there a little'? Is the work a unity or a plurality? Our authoress belongs to the army of Chorizontes, follows the flag of Münscher and Pohlenz and fights valiantly for the cause. According to her the *Hellenica* is tripartite, the divisions coming at the end of Bk. II. and of V. 1; and of the three parts the second is probably the earliest. The orations in each part are severally subjected to a minute analysis, with special attention to their rhetorical style; and this detailed examination is followed by a 'Conspicuum orationum, dialogorum, sententiarum insertarum'; after which we have a 'conclusio' discussing 'quibus de causis Xenophon orationes Hellenicis inseruerit,' in which we are informed at great length that it was the fashion for historians to insert such speeches; but a better reason is to be found in the fact that the speeches enabled them to lie magnificently! Altogether, this is a painstaking production in readable Latin, and it deserves commendation accordingly.

R. G. BURY.

*Loeb Classical Library:* (1) *Aristotle: The Nicomachean Ethics*, with an English translation by H. RACKHAM, M.A. (2) *Aristotle: The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, with an English translation by J. H. FREESE. Pp. (1) xxvi + 650; (2) xlvii + 492. London: Heinemann, 1926. Cloth, 10s. per vol.; leather, 12s. 6d. per vol.

EACH of these volumes in the Loeb series has a recent rival in the Oxford translation of Aristotle's works. The purpose of the two series is of course somewhat different; but it is none the less interesting to compare Mr. Rackham's with Mr. Ross's version of the *Ethics*, and Mr. Freese's with Mr. Rhys Roberts' version of the *Rhetoric*. The advantage in respect of precision lies, I think, in both cases beyond doubt with the Oxford translator. As

a piece of English Mr. Rackham's version is perhaps slightly more readable than Mr. Ross's; but Mr. Freese must yield place here again to Mr. Roberts. Speaking generally and apart from comparison, we find Mr. Rackham's *Ethics* a careful and scholarly version, which will serve its purpose very well. Mr. Freese also gives a sound workable version, but he is too apt to fall into a looseness of phraseology which often blurs the outlines of Aristotle's thought.

We venture to suggest that for any reissue Mr. Rackham should reconsider the following passages: I. ii. 1 (*βουλόμεθα* 'we will,' but *βούλομαι* is consistently 'wish'); I. iii. 2 ('Moral Nobility and Justice' are surely *not* the subjects studied by political science'); I. iv. 5 (*γνώριμον* should be translated by the same word on both sides of the antithesis, γ. *ἡμῖν* and γ. *ἀπλῶς*); I. vii. 16 (the translation misrepresents *ἐν δ' ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ*, which is an addition to the definition of happiness just given). II. ii. 5 (*ὁ παρὼν λόγος* is not a theory investigated, but the discussion now proceeding); II. vi. 15 (if *ᾧ δὲ* in the definition of virtue must be rejected, it should be accorded the honours of war and correctly translated; it could not possibly have the meaning given it in R.'s footnote: see Aspasius). III. i. 1 and 24 ('feelings' will perhaps do for *πάθος*, but 'voluntary feelings' is awkward; and the adjective *ἐκούσιος* is not applied to *πάθος* by Aristotle); III. v. 17 (the co-ordination of *εἰ μὲν οὖν . . . εἰ δὲ μή* seems to be ignored, and Aristotle's reply must surely begin at *εἰ μὲν οὖν*). V. i. 1 (Vinogradoff's explanation of *δικαιοσύνη* in the general sense demands at least mention); V. i. 20 (a difference in *εἶνα* cannot be a difference only for thought). VI. iii. 1 (if 'art' meant 'technical skill' or 'craftsmanship' for Aristotle, it would not be an intermediate term between *ἐμπειρία* and *ἐπιστήμη*, nor would an essay on the principles of speaking be called a *τέχνη*).

We have also noted the following queries in the *Rhetoric*: I. i. 1 ('confined' should be 'allotted'); I. i. 10 and ii. 1 (*μέθοδος* does not mean 'method,' but corresponds more nearly to our 'science'); I. vi. 12 (*κτήρις* should surely be 'possession' rather than 'acquisition,' since wealth is not good *getting*, but good *having*); I. xiv. 1 ('inheres in' for *ἐνυπάρχειν* is clumsy and misleading; rather 'is contained in'). II. iii. 1 (*πρῶτος ἔχοντι* cannot mean 'become mild'; and 'such' in 'be such' five lines lower has no reference). III. xvi. 1 (Aristotle would surely never say that a narrative ought to be 'disjointed': the opposite of 'consecutive' is 'broken' or 'intermittent'). J. L. STOCKS.

*Geschichte des Hellenismus.* Band II.: Das Wesen des Hellenismus. BY JULIUS KAERST. Pp. xii+409. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1926. R.M. 18.

THIS is a new edition of Kaerst's *Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*, Vol. II., 1—now called *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Vol. II.; the author promises a third volume to complete his picture of Hellenism. This volume, though with fewer

pages, is rather longer than the old one. In the historical part, B.C. 323-301, it is a new edition only; most of the more important new material has been considered (the Nicocles coin is an exception), but sometimes in notes only; the chief textual alterations are due to the recognition of Antigonus' war with Seleucus after 311, and to acceptance of the now certain fact that Antigonus and not Ptolemy founded the Island League, which has also enabled the appendix on King-worship to be shortened. There are four new appendices—that on Sarapis accepts the Sinope tradition but cannot explain it, that on the Babylonian Chronicle follows Otto (though there is a good deal more to the question than Kaerst gives); the old appendices on King-worship and the satrapy question remain, but that on the *Humanitätsidee* is omitted. The main body of the book, however—Books V. on Hellenistic Culture and VI. on the Hellenistic State—is more than a second edition; parts have been recast, and the three most important chapters, those on Religion (V. 4), on Hellenistic Culture historically considered (V. 5), and on the Monarchical Idea (VI. 1), have been partly rewritten, as has the end of V. 3, on Specialisation and Division of Labour; the result is a distinct gain both in matter and interest. V. 4 is considerably expanded and contains a much fuller account of the Oriental background; the part dealing with Syncretism is the best study there is. VI. 1 now includes an examination of the Soter idea, and V. 4 ends with a (new) discussion of why Hellenism fell; in this, though giving weight to Rome and Orientalisation, Kaerst decides that the cause really lay in the Hellenistic civilisation itself, primarily in too much individualism—a view likely to be controverted. The merits of the book are too well known to need notice, though I doubt myself whether the basis of fact be always sufficient to carry the superstructure of theory here built up. But the attractiveness of Kaerst's philosophising of Hellenistic history is unquestionable, and no one who desires to understand the period can afford to leave it unread. W. W. TARN.

*Untersuchungen zu den Schriften des Hermes Trismegistos.* Inaugural Dissertation. BY FRIEDRICH BRAUNINGER. Pp. 41. Grafenheiden: C. Schulze and Co., 1926.

THIS dissertation, which provides a good starting-point for the investigation of the philosophical and religious content of the *corpus Hermeticum*, takes for its criterion the occurrence of two words, *γινώσκειν* and *νοεῖν*, and their cognates. The former, in its technical meaning 'to have (mystic) knowledge or intuition (of God)' is to be found, with few and easily explained exceptions, only in C.H. I, III, IV, VI, VII, X, XIII, and the isolated passage IX, 4. The content of all these treatises is mystical, Oriental (although the phraseology of Greek philosophy is used), ascetic and other-worldly. Fate (*εἰμαρμένη*) is regarded throughout as bad, a crushing yoke from which the mystic gnosis is to deliver the elect. The tone of the other group is entirely different. On familiar Platonizing Stoic lines, it regards

είμαρμένη as the cosmic order, the visible expression in the material universe of Divine Providence, and therefore as a thing to be acquiesced in and warmly admired. In place of a mystic gnosis of God, it has an intellectual approach, through the created to the Creator, expressed by the verb νοεῖν. Hence it is clear, not only that the *corpus* cannot be the work of any one body of thought, nor the text-book of any one sect, but probably that its formation is late, if not so late (*circa* 1050) as Scott supposes. A number of subordinate points are interestingly discussed.

H. J. ROSE.

*Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. Edidit HUGO RABE. Pp. xxx+79. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. M. 3.60.

THIS edition of Aphthonius forms the tenth volume in the Teubner series of *Rhetores Graeci*, and besides Aphthonius it includes fragments from other writers on the art of rhetoric, of whom the most considerable is Sopater. In his preface the editor states his views about the MS. tradition, collects the pertinent *testimonia*, and in general supplies all the available information upon his subject in succinct Latin. These 'preliminary exercises' themselves are of no great interest—unless we except that perennial topic of discussion, *ἐὶ γαμήτειον*, 'Is marriage a failure?'—but they serve to throw light on the manner in which the professors of that age sought to instruct their pupils, the budding barristers of Syria. For Aphthonius is reputed to have been a native of Syrian Antioch, and tradition also tells us that he was a disciple of the more famous orator Libanius. This being so, it is curious to notice that Liddell and Scott (in past editions) put down A.D. 315 as the *floruit* of Aphthonius and A.D. 350 as that of Libanius; and, to make confusion worse confounded, we are informed by Mr. Rabe that Libanius wrote a letter to Aphthonius in 392, by which time the former ought in all decency to have been dead and the latter dust. The editorial work is evidently carried out with care and diligence, and the form is worthy of the famous publishing house.

R. G. BURY.

*Saint Basil: The Letters*. In four volumes. Vol. I. With an English translation by ROY J. DEFERRARI. Pp. lv+366. London: Heinemann (Loeb Series), 1926. 10s. net.

*Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History*. In two volumes. Vol. I. With an English translation by KIRSOPP LAKE. Pp. lvi+525. London: Heinemann (Loeb Series), 1926. 10s. net.

SIX MSS. of Basil's Letters (including two not used by the Benedictines) had been collated by the author and Van den Ven, with a view to a new text of the Letters, when the war intervened. The text here given is based on that collation. Professor Deferrari frankly confesses that it is not only provisional in itself, but partly antiquated by the work of the Abbé de Bessières (*J.T.S.* XXI., 1919, pp. 1 ff.; and Oxford, 1923). The Loeb collation includes no representative

of the most important family in the *stemma* drawn up by the Abbé. The author, in effect, has had to choose between paying fifteen shillings in the pound and postponing payment indefinitely. Few will quarrel with his decision.

Whether the Douay Version (with its brother of Rheims) is the best vehicle for scriptural quotation in the Loeb library is a purely literary question, which has doubtless received the attention of the general editors of the series. It is occasionally disconcerting. In the sixth beatitude (Matthew 5, 8) 'pure in heart,' not 'clean of heart' (p. 89), awakes in the vast majority of English readers the associations which *καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ* conveyed to Basil; in Luke 17, 2 (p. 299) 'scandalise one of these little ones' jars on the ear of the modern Englishman; on p. 243, Philippians 3, 13-14, when rendered 'Forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth myself to those that are before I press towards the mark, to the prize of the *supernal* vocation,' is, for the stylist, 'butchered to make a Roman holiday.'

Basil's style, packed with literary and scriptural allusion, yet vigorous and individual, is hard to reproduce in English. This is a careful and conscientious version, which seldom follows Basil into elegance or eloquence, but never shirks difficulties. Of a list of passages which challenge comment the following are typical. On p. 7, for *βίων γίγωνα*, 'have been put at ease,' is hardly strong enough; neither is 'bereft' as a translation of *ἀπεστερήθημεν* (followed by *ἀπεδώκαμεν τῷ χρίσαντι*) on p. 37. On p. 49 *πατρίς* is '(native) city,' a common fourth-century use. On p. 50 *τι* (*an te?*) and *πυκνότερον* are not contrasted, as the translation suggests. On p. 98 *γράμμασι* are surely 'letters,' not 'words.' On p. 100 *τὰς κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις* are 'your virtuous activities,' 'your good works.' On p. 110 *τῶν κατὰ θῆραν ἐπιμυγνυμένων ἡμῖν* are 'those who drop in on us when they are hunting,' not 'the guests who join me in hunting.' On p. 112 *μητρόπολις* is the courtesy title familiar to epigraphists and numismatists rather than 'our home city.' On p. 192, l. 4, the context shows that *οἶκον* is 'property,' not 'household,' as *οἶκος* is three lines lower. On p. 316 *ἀθλον παντὶ πλὴν ἢ τῷ Θεῷ* is annotated: 'part of a senarius line, but its source is unknown.' Its source is Plato, *Apology* 42. Basil had steeped himself in Plato; and although he quoted much from memory this passage has a bearing on the textual question in the *Apology* (Burnet reads *πλὴν εἰ*). On p. 318, l. 6, there is a misprint. On p. 322 *οὐδὲ προελόμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν* is misunderstood, or mauled; in the next sentence there should probably be a full stop after *ἀνδρα*, the following *ὥς . . . ὥς . . . ὅσον* being exclamatory. On pp. 330, 331, is not either *ὑπερκειμένη* or 'underlying' a slip?

The Letters of Basil are a welcome addition to the Loeb library, and Professor Deferrari deserves warm thanks for this first instalment of his arduous undertaking.

Kirsopp Lake's text is that of Schwartz. The translation of Eusebius, again a difficult task, is excellently done, and the introduction and notes

are judicious. On p. 247 a touch of local colour has been lost. The native town of the converted-brigand is given in the *Chronicon Paschale* as Smyrna; and a Smyrniote brigand who κατέληφεν τὸ ὄρος has taken not to 'the mountains' but to 'the mountain'—i.e. Tmolus—just as the famous Chakyrjy did in the twentieth century. On p. 473 διαθεβρλημένη is strangely rendered 'torn in two'; and on p. 477 the phrasing of note 2 suggests that Avircius was the *author* of the tractate addressed to him. The penultimate sentence of note 2 on p. 47 should run: 'The evidence for two Syrian governorships of Quirinius is conclusive (Lapis Tiburtinus and Lapis Venetus); the evidence for a census in Judaea during his first governorship is Luke 2, 1-5, taken in conjunction with Matthew 2, and supported by the analogy of Kietis in A.D. 36 (Tacitus, *Ann.* VI. 41); see Ramsay, *Bearing*, etc., p. 234.'

W. M. CALDER.

*Die Duenos-Inscript.* Von EMIL GOLDMANN. Pp. xiii + 176, with two plates. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1926.

THE Duenos inscription, which can, on epigraphical grounds, be assigned to the fourth century B.C., contains 138 or 139 letters. Of these four or five groups, *devos*, *cosmis*, *ted*, *med*, *feced*, appear to form Latin words otherwise known; apart from the limitations imposed by recognition of these, the solver of the puzzle has complete liberty of action, and can cut up the inscription into such lengths as from time to time suit his ingenuity. Dr. Goldmann reproduces and criticises the interpretations of over 30 predecessors, and gives a new one of his own. He starts with the assumption that the inscription contains a magic formula, and cuts up the inscription into words which, if they were known to have existed, might have borne the meanings assigned to them. But his restoration of the inscription bears too little resemblance to any kind of Latin known outside etymological dictionaries to be anything but a pleasing *jeu d'esprit*; and, in this respect, it maintains worthily a long tradition. Two or three details may be noticed. On p. 78 *med mitat* is translated as if the verb *mittere* could mean 'zauberisch wirken lassen,' but no examples of this use of the word are produced. In spite of Dr. Goldmann's very proper distrust of forms manufactured *ad hoc*, he himself, p. 114, invents a new adjective \**opetos*, 'useful,' which, after serious consideration, he discards for the better attested *obitus*. On p. 128 *enmanom* of the inscription is equated with *immanem*, 'Zauberkräftig'; here a new meaning is invented, as for the following (*mei*)*nom*, 'weak in magic power.'

The puzzle remains unsolved, but would-be solvers must now consult Dr. Goldmann's work. J. FRASER.

*Il Proemio degli Annali di Q. Ennio.* By G. B. PIGHI. Pp. 56. Milan: Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero,' 1926. 4 lire.

THIS pamphlet is described as 'a study in

arrangement and exegesis.' In his series of essayettes, on such subjects as the speech of Homer and the reason for his tears, and in his expanded prose paraphrase of the actual fragments, Dr. Pighi is at his best. It is in the arrangement of the restored text that he is least convincing. We cannot accept his statement that *loca aspera, saxa tesca* (of which both authenticity and *provenance* are doubtful) is necessarily a description of Parnassus, or that *Simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis* belongs to Homer's speech. Still less can we agree that the famous *Lunai portum* of Persius (VI. 9) forms no part of the Ennius fragment, and may therefore be 'emended' to *Romai uatem*. But the work is not without value, if merely as another indication of the reality of the too long delayed revival of interest in Ennius.

ETHEL MARY STEUART.

*M. Tulli Ciceronis de Divinatione Liber Secundus.* Part II. With Commentary by ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE. Pp. 463-656. University of Illinois Press, 1923. \$1.50.

A NOTICE has (*mea culpa*) long been overdue of the second part of Dr. Pease's edition of the *De Divinatione*. It consists in the main of the remainder of the text of the second book (chaps. XXXII.-LXVII.) with the same full commentary as before. In writing of the two first volumes (*C.R.* XXXVII., 1923, p. 30), I assumed perhaps too rashly that the book was intended for the use of ordinary students of the classics, and expressed some 'grumbles' at its plan. I have since learned from the author that his intention was rather to provide references and bibliography for more advanced students who wished to pursue any point of religious, historical, or literary interest which is raised by the text. In that aspect much of my 'grumbling' was beside the mark, though I still think that the notes with their superabundance of bracketed references are confusing to read, and that occasionally even advanced students would have been glad of a little more guidance through difficult passages, such as the very technical discussion on astrology in §89, and the obscure sentence which introduces the *peremnia* in §77. But in general Dr. Pease's careful and exhaustive collection of material will prove an invaluable storehouse of information. Special attention might be drawn to the excellent notes on *umbilicus terrarum* (LVI. 115), and on *superstitio* and *religio* (LXXII. 148); in all these ample material is provided for the formation of a judgment on vexed questions, though Dr. Pease characteristically keeps his own view in the background.

The commentary is followed by some addenda to the notes in all four volumes, a very valuable account of the MSS. and editions of the *De Divinatione*, and an ample index. Dr. Pease is certainly to be congratulated on having brought a great undertaking to a conclusion; his edition must for a long time hold the field, and prove of great service to students of the difficult subject of ancient divination in general.

C. BAILEY.

*Staat und Manufaktur im Römischen Reiche.*

By AXEL W. PERSSON. Pp. 144. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1923. 5 kr.

I CAN only repeat here what I have already said at greater length about this useful monograph in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 1924 (Vol. XIV.), p. 267. It discusses state control of industries, first in Ptolemaic Egypt (pp. 1-18), and then in Egypt under the Roman rule (pp. 19-37): this is followed by a detailed treatment of the subject in the Roman Empire down to the fifth century, which forms the main body of the pamphlet (pp. 38-116). At the end there is a good four-page summary in English, and full indices complete the volume. As a study in ancient economic history it is of real value, but it devotes more attention to the state production and selling of textiles, and less (for instance) to the state arms manufactures: the documentation, both from ancient sources and modern authorities, is full and ample. It is, in fact, a work of permanent utility as a detailed study of an interesting subject, work that will not need to be done again for some time.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*The Problem of Claudius.* (Some Aspects of a Character Study.) By THOMAS DE COURSEY RUTH. Pp. 138. Baltimore, Md: The Lord Baltimore Press, 1924. 6s.

THIS is a book at once interesting and tantalising: Mr. Ruth had finished it by 1916, but was unable to publish it until late in 1924, and it suffers somewhat from lack of more recent information. But it is full of good matter: the author has gathered all the evidence for Claudius' personality and character that he can glean from Pliny, Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius and the rest, and marshalled it into chapters on Claudius' timidity, his *persecutio*, his alleged cruelty, his humanity, and so on (rather in the Suetonian fashion). Some allusions have escaped him (in Lydus and Largus, for instance), otherwise the book is very complete and thorough; but just as we are expecting a section on Claudius' statesmanship, or on his policy at home and abroad, or a treatment of his speeches and edicts (and a great deal could be won from a careful study of these), the author turns aside to a medical diagnosis and pronounces that Claudius suffered from 'paraplegic rigidity, or Little's disease.' This, however true, seems a little disappointing; after so detailed and scholarly a review of the evidence, we might have had some estimate of Claudius as man and ruler, and to be offered paraplegic rigidity is a stiff substitute. But the book is undeniably good, and I can only hope that Mr. Ruth is now at work upon a second part, and that it will contain a full treatment of Claudius' foreign and domestic policy, his attitude towards foreign religions, and his handling of the Jewish question, in view of what has come to light within recent years, for the writer is well equipped to deal with the subject.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*L'Octavien de Minucius Felix et l'Apologétique de Tertullien.*

By GEORGES HINNISDAELS. Pp. 139. Bruxelles: Hayez, 1924.

*De Tertulliano et Minucio Felice.* By J. G. P. BORLEFFS. Pp. 119. Groningen: Wolters, 1925.

EACH of these studies aims at proving the priority of Minucius Felix; both explain the similarities in the *Octavien* and the *Apology* by the supposition that Tertullian had before his eyes the work of the earlier apologist. Hinnisdæls' introduction gives a careful account of the various theories which have been put forward on the relations between the two authors; his main object is to examine and to refute the case presented by R. Heinze for the priority of Tertullian. His method is to examine the theological and religious teaching of both apologies, in the course of which he writes what is an interesting and useful commentary on the contents and the background of both. Borleffs follows the same method; his discussion covers perhaps more ground, but in less detail.

However useful these contributions may be, they provoke regret that so much time and thought should be expended upon a problem which is as near solution as it will ever be. When so much else in later Latin literature remains untouched, such expenditure of labour is a doubtful gain.

J. H. BAXTER.

*S. Aureli Augustini, Hipponensis Episcopi, De Cathecizandis Rudibus.* Translated, with an Introduction, Commentary, and Indices, by JOSEPH P. CHRISTOPHER. Pp. xx+365. The Catholic Education Press: Brookland, D.C., U.S.A., 1926. \$3.00.

WE learn, from the brief 'vita' attached to this portly volume, that Mr. Christopher is a comparatively young man (he was born in 1890), and that the present volume was submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. We presume he was admitted to his doctorate; certainly this work deserves that honour. We have far too few really adequate editions of the Patristic writers, in whole or part; but it is noteworthy that some attempt has been made, in recent years, to rectify this defect. Mayor's edition of the *Apologeticus* of Tertullian, together with his brilliant monograph on the Latin Hexateuch, have done much to wipe away from English letters the reproach that our scholars were but slenderly equipped for work of this sort; Hort and Mayor's edition of the seventh book of *Stromateis* of Clement was a notable performance; Dr. Souter has recently enriched scholarship with his fine work on Pelagius; Bishop Lightfoot's editions of Ignatius and (the Roman) Clement are classics; and Archdeacon Gifford, in his old age, produced an edition of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* of Eusebius, which was worthy of the great University that published it. Quite recently Dean Welldon published an edition of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei*, which deserves mention, though it must be owned that it is rather in the nature of stop-gap work—useful for average

students, but no more. Dr. Christopher's volume is a genuine contribution to Patristic study. If the introduction is too meagre to be of first-rate importance, the commentary is full and learned throughout. Few difficulties are shirked; and the translation—which faces the Latin text—enables us at all times to see exactly how the editor proposes to construe the original. It moves a little heavily at times, but it is at least close, and (so far as one can judge) accurate. The text follows, apparently, that of the Benedictine edition (reprinted by Migne in 1865), with but few changes. The value of Dr. Christopher's edition would have been increased had he given us a critically revised text, with a brief apparatus criticus. But he has not done so; it is to the exegesis of the text, rather than to critical discussions, that he has devoted his labours. The section on 'style' (Introduction, pp. 10-12) is singularly jejune; surely it would have been worth while to write something more adequate to the occasion; Watson has shown us, in his monograph on Cyprian (*Studia Biblica*), how this sort of thing ought to be done. At the same time, it must not be overlooked that a good number of the notes are devoted to elucidating points of style (e.g. i 9; ii 4; iii 29; viii 24; xvii 15; xxii 7; and elsewhere); but this is not enough. Dr. Christopher is often very happy in the parallel passages he quotes. The bibliography is full and useful, but not always perfectly accurate; as far as I have examined them, the indices are trustworthy. We hope Dr. Christopher will be encouraged, by the reception given to this—his first—commentary, to gird himself to other tasks in the same (more or less) unworked field. The Letters of Jerome—full of interesting sidelights on social manners—sorely need a good editor.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

*Cicero: Philippics.* Translated by W. C. A. KER. (Loeb Series.) Pp. xi+654. London: Heinemann, 1926. 10s.

CICERO'S *Philippics* have suffered from the fact that the first two speeches of the series have become school classics and thus tend to obliterate Nos. 3 to 14. Yet the later speeches throw many new lights on the orator's art and ethos. In No. 13 Cicero gives free rein to his powers of repartee; in No. 8 he mends his manners and sets himself to refute without giving offence; in No. 9 he exhibits his latent fine feeling and warmth of heart; in No. 12 he loses his nerve at the prospect of physical danger and almost repeats the fiasco of the *Miloniana*. Moreover, in the case of the *Philippics*, the whole is greater than the parts. Only by reading *usque ad mala* can we appreciate the daemonic energy which carried Rome's resuscitated veteran through his 'Midlothian campaign.' The editors of the Loeb series deserve our thanks for giving us the *Philippics en bloc*, not in samples.

Mr. Ker's translation is a careful and conscientious piece of work. Here and there he uses a misleading expression:

P. 25. 'Veterani qui appellabantur' = 'those that claimed the name of veterans.'

P. 43. 'Operas mercennarias' = 'a gang of suborned labourers.'

P. 77. 'Cuius tibi fatum sicut C. Curioni manet' = 'whose fate awaits you, as it does C. Curio.'

Pp. 167, 595. 'Sanctus' (i.e., 'upright, respectable') = 'pious' and 'holy.'

P. 217. 'In ore habebat' = 'he had in his eye.'

P. 269. 'Antesignanus' = 'colour-sergeant.'

P. 287. 'Qui peregre depugnari' = 'as being one that fought abroad' (add 'as a gladiator').

P. 355. For 'Firmium' read 'Firmum.'

A few colloquialisms have also crept in: 'They were willing to have agreed' (p. 115); 'all this is done quicker than my description' (p. 147); 'a tavern blow-out' (p. 209-11); 'he will find no man fairer than I' (p. 259).

A more general criticism is that Mr. Ker has perhaps carried literalness somewhat too far, with the result that his English at times seems tame as compared with the Latin. But this defect may be claimed a merit in the Loeb series; at any rate Mr. Ker's translation is an excellent guide to the Latin.

The introduction and notes are of necessity brief. These, too, require an occasional retouch. The tribune of 49 B.C. was Quintus, not Aulus Cassius (p. 5). The fund which Antony acquired on the morrow of Caesar's murder was Caesar's private fortune, not the public treasure (p. 8). Sex. Pompeius conquered most of Baetica, but not the whole of the Iberian peninsula (p. 542). More serious than these slips are the errors concerning the distribution of the provinces. To mention but the most important point, it is practically certain that Macedonia and Syria had not been assigned to M. Brutus and Cassius by Caesar, and that Antony did not injure these two when he secured the provinces in question for himself and Dolabella. (For other details see Sternkopf's masterly article in *Hermes* 1912, or Mr. Denniston's summary in his ed. of *Philippics* I. and II., Appendix I.) With these reservations Mr. Ker's historical explanations will be found accurate and most helpful.

Altogether, Mr. Ker's translation is a valuable addition to the Loeb series. It should serve to initiate its readers to the many-sidedness of Cicero's art.

M. CARY.

*An Economic History of Rome.* By TENNEY FRANK. Pp. xi+519. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1927. 13s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR TENNEY FRANK'S book is a good deal more than a new edition of his economic history published in 1920 and reviewed in the *C.R.* XXXIV. p. 178. His subject then was limited to the republican period, and even on this he has added two new chapters on provincial policy and financial interests in the last age of the republic. But, besides doing this, he has now included the economic history of the early empire. Thus, more than a third of the matter in this edition is entirely new. And the extension of the work is amply justified by its interest and value. The author very properly disclaims any competition with Professor Ros-tovtzeff's monumental work; but by extending

his period, he has not only made the abundant references in his earlier work to the Digest and to inscriptions of imperial date strictly relevant, but has given us the best complete account of the economic history of Rome in existence.

W. W. HOW.

*The Old Oligarch, being the Constitution of the Athenians ascribed to Xenophon.* By J. A. PETCH. Pp. 29. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1s. 6d.

THE work consists of an Introduction of less than eight pages and a translation of the text. The Introduction is of little value. In the discussion of the date it seems to be forgotten that a date later than 413 B.C. is excluded by the references to the *phōpos*, and what is said as to the object of the tract comes to very little. It would have been wiser to have had no Introduction, and to have devoted the eight pages to a discussion of the more difficult passages in the text. The translation has no claim to elegance. Unfortunately, it is disfigured by blunders. 'Ἐκατοστή (I. 17) is translated 'five per cent,' λίνον (II. 11) appears as 'cloth' (it is odd to read that 'my ships are made of somebody's wood, somebody's iron, and somebody's cloth'), and περὶ τοῦ πολέμου (III. 2) is rendered 'relating to war.'

E. M. WALKER.

*Prehistoric and Roman Wales.* By R. E. M. WHEELER, D.Lit., F.S.A. Pp. 299, Frontispiece, 109 figures, and 4 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 18s.

IT is to be regretted that the portion of Dr. Wheeler's 'scrap-book'—would that all scrap-books were so full of well-digested matter—which chiefly concerns this journal is the least important of the whole. In the first six chapters we are given an exposition, invaluable for the prehistorian, of the data for the story of Wales from Aurignac days to the tenuous Welsh Early Iron Age. If the tale sometimes labours somewhat, that is the fault not of the teller but of the tale itself. The record is however clear and sane, though more than once Dr. Wheeler unfortunately countenances the redundant clumsiness of current prehistoric terminology. It is this, by far the more substantial and valuable portion of the book, which has here to be ignored, except in so far as it prepares the way for the seventh chapter, that on Roman Wales.

The chapter on the Roman occupation is a useful summary of the position of Wales under the Empire, but naturally, as it is in substance a public lecture, it in no way supersedes Haverfield's *Military Aspects of Roman Wales* as a source-book. Comparatively little detailed evidence is given, and the value of this chapter rests in the attempt to summarise the history of the Principality in Roman times. That the attempt is not completely successful is to be ascribed for the most part to the lack of evidence, but the suggestion that the extensive activity under Severus was a 'showing of the flag' seems most unfortunate. Until we know more as a result of such careful excavation as Dr. Wheeler himself has carried out it is well to restrain interpretation. Dr. Wheeler has himself remarkably well

in hand save for this unhappy suggestion, the more unhappy as he himself is aware of the danger of so-called parallels from modern Imperialism, and on the subsequent page (234) mentions Irish immigration as taking place as early as the second century. To check evil results of such movement a strengthening of the frontier region might well be called for, and under Severus the frontier was still not a line but a belt.

The worth of this account of Roman Wales, regarded as a summary of temporary conclusions from the available evidence, is however obvious, and such small points as the description of Silchester as 'a garden city' do not greatly detract therefrom. Especial attention is merited by the comment (page 252) with regard to the evidence to be drawn from the latest coins of the Empire found in Britain. When it is remembered, and it is the recent tendency to forget, that 'by the end of the fourth century the issue of official copper currency had practically ceased in the West, and old coins remained long in use,' the whole problem of the 'evacuation' is once again restored to its proper complexity.

We venture to compliment Dr. Wheeler on the skill and erudition he has brought to bear upon his difficult task. He expresses the hope that his own book 'may soon be superseded by a work more commensurate with the material.' We rather believe that his book, though it soon may be further developed and expanded, by Dr. Wheeler himself it is to be hoped, will hardly be 'superseded,' at least as a collection of the prehistoric material, for many years.

J. A. PETCH.

*Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami: denuo recognitum et auctum.* Per P. S. ALLEN, M.A., D.Lit., et H. M. ALLEN. Vol. VI., 1525-1527. Oxonii: In Typographeo Clarendoniano, MCMXXVI.

THE sixth volume of Dr. and Mrs. Allen's monumental edition contains two hundred and seventy letters, of which ninety-two are written to Erasmus. The bulk of them deal in the main with theological controversy. Erasmus is, as he puts it, taking a middle course between Scylla and Charybdis, attacked on the one side by Luther and the reformers and on the other by monks, friars, and the Sorbonne. His own leanings to reform he is very careful only to impart to intimate friends like Pirckheimer. Occasionally he criticises the Cicero-worshippers of Italy, and it appears from letter 1720 that, following a suggestion of Froben, he had already planned the *Ciceronianus*. Of his English friends, Mountjoy appears to have broken off relations, but there are letters from Bishops Longland and Tunstall, from Lupset and Robert Aldridge, and Erasmus himself writes to Longland, Wolsey, and Reginald Pole. Erasmus' amazing memory is well illustrated by his correspondence with Aldridge. In December, 1525, he asks Aldridge to collate a MS. of Seneca in King's College Library. A year later Aldridge sends a volume with collations from a King's MS. and a

Peterhouse MS., which the name of Erasmus had enabled him to borrow. Erasmus in reply makes no mention of the Peterhouse MS., but says the King's one is worthless, and the librarians have deceived him. He then gives a minute description of the MS. he really wants collated as being in the smaller library, and tentatively suggests that Aldridge might take the trouble. Cambridge was deserted on account of the sweating

sickness in 1526; so Aldridge had been unable to get a companion to read the MS. to him.

Thirty letters are printed for the first time in this volume. This correspondence with the Antwerp banker Erasmus Schets begins in 1535. Schets writes a vigorous and unconventional Latin, full of curious forms, but always easy to understand, and he is a thorough-going hero-worshipper. G. C. RICHARDS.

## OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following papers were read in the summer term:

'The Date of Plato's Republic.' Professor G. C. Field.

'The Character and Policy of Domitian in the Light of his Coinage.' Mr. H. Mattingly.

'Early Mediterranean Languages and Peoples.' Professor G. E. K. Brauholtz.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1927.)

ANTIQUITIES.—May 9. K. Regling, *Die antike Münze als Kunstwerk* [Berlin: Schoetz und Parrhysius, 1924] (J. G. Milne). Highly praised for its scholarship, and as a joy to any lover of art.—May 16. L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of our Era* [New York: Macmillan, 1923. Two vols.] (E. Riess). A good collection of material, but prolix and uncritical.

GEOGRAPHY.—May 16. O. Cuntz, *Die Geographie des Ptolemaeus: Galliae, Germania, Raetia, Noricum, Pannoniae, Illyricum, Italia* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1923] (W. W. Hyde). A thorough investigation of MSS., methods, and sources for an important section of the *Geography*. 'Has placed the critical study of Ptolemy on a new basis.'

HISTORY AND ECONOMICS.—May 2. M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im Hellenistischen Aegypten. I. Band: Der Betrieb der Landwirtschaft* [Munich: Beck, 1925] (M. Rosstovtzeff). Highly praised, but R. regrets that S. has not paid more attention to the historical development of Egyptian agriculture, to a comparison with agriculture elsewhere, and to archaeological finds.—Sir S. Dill, *Roman Society in Gaul in the Merovingian Age* [London: Macmillan, 1926] (T. Frank). Praised.—May 9. G. Glotz, *The Aegean Civilisation* [New York: Knopf, 1925] (T. L. Shear). Translation from the French original (1923). Highly praised.—May 16. F. Münzer, *Die politische Vernichtung des Griechentums* [Leipzig: Dietrich, 1925] (W. S. Ferguson). An interesting pamphlet, based on the analogy between Macedonia in Greece and Prussia in modern Germany.—May 23. M. Rosstovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World. Vol. I: The Orient and Greece. Translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff* [Oxford University Press, 1926] (C. J. Kraemer). Praised as a judicious summary by a master hand.

LITERATURE.—April 11. E. Schwartz, *Die*

*Odyssee* [Munich: Hueber, 1924]. W. Dörpfeld, *Homers Odyssee* [Munich: Buchenau und Reichert, 1924] (S. E. Bassett). Two new dissection theories, entirely different from each other, both of which B. profoundly disbelieves.—May 2. J. M. Campbell, *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great* [Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1922] (H. M. Hubbell). A doctoral dissertation, largely dealing with statistics of the use of rhetorical figures.—May 9. A. O'Brien-Moore, *Madness in Ancient Literature* [Weimar: Wagner, 1924] (W. S. Fox). A Princeton dissertation, dealing 'in an indefinite way with an indefinite subject,' but illuminating many passages, especially in the tragedians.—May 16. J. A. Scott, *Homer and His Influence* [Boston: Marshall Jones, 1925, in 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome'] (A. Shewan). Praised.

PHILOSOPHY.—May 9. W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Metaphysics. A Revised Text, with Introduction and Commentary* [Oxford University Press, 1924; 2 vols.] (C. Knapp). Praised.

### MUSÉE BELGE XXXI, Nos. 1-3 (JANUARY, 1927).

N. Hohlwein, *La Papyrologie grecque*. Inaugural lecture of course in P. at Liège. J. Meunier, *Pour une lecture candide de l'Épigramme à Aulis. I. Le rôle de Ménélas. II. Sur un vers obscur*. M.'s reply to 538-40 is the appearance of Achilles: his hypocrisy (cp. 498-9) is a mainspring of the drama. In 521 keep  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu\ \gamma'\ \alpha\chi\eta\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  and interpret *nihil* (=nunquam) non adhibitum. P. d'Hérouville, *Virgile apiculteur*. V.'s errors and omissions: the king-bee error was not quite general, cp. Xen. *Oecon.* VII. 17. L. Herrmann, *Sénèque et le Judaïsme*. Frankly hostile, *Ep.* 95. 67; 108. 22: *ap. Aug. Civ. Dei* VI. 11 (*sceleratissima gens*). Id., *Sur deux MSS. bruxellois du Carmen de Ave Phoenix et un MS. du Est et Non*. G. Méautis, *Le grand Pan est mort*. Origin of

Plutarch's particular form of the legend, *de defectu orac.* 17 (cp. *de Is. et Osir.* 355e) to be sought in Egypt. *Hommage à Mgr. Buliž.*

*ID. XXXI, No. 2 (sic) (APRIL, 1927).*

P. Faider, *Le comique de Plaute*. Uses the natural sources of laughter, but avoids *scurrilitas*: language correct and does not pass limits of the picturesque. L. Derochette, *Essai d'interprétation de quelques périphrases de Lucrèce. Animi natura animaeque potestas*, etc., not mere verbalism, but contribute to the argument. R. Scalais, *Les revenus que les Romains attendaient de l'agriculture*. Not great: agric. was praised for other reasons. J. Meunier, *L'Iphigénie à Aulis*. III. *Le Prologue*. Defends against criticisms of Parmentier. P. d'Hérouville, *Virgile apiculteur*. III.

**MUSÉE BELGE. BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE.**  
*XXXI, Nos. 1-3 (JAN., 1927).*

Alverne, *Société des Amis des Catacombes*. J. Gessler, *A propos d'un MS. liégeois de saint Augustin*.

GREEK.—*Lysias*: L. Gernet and M. Bizos, *L.: tome II.*, Budé, 1926. Conscientious and useful (A. Willem). *Marcus Aurelius*: G. Loisel, *M.A. à moi-même*, Presses Universitaires, 1926, 15 fr. Good translation by an enthusiast, but should not deny persecution of Christians (G. Hinisdaels). *Plato*: M. Meunier, *La Légende de Socrate*, L'Édition d'Art, Paris, 1926, 14 fr. Cleverly written for general public (A. Willem). A. Rivaud, *P. t. X.: Timée, Critias*, Budé, 1925. Scholarly and can explain mathematics (J. Meunier). *Sophocles: Trach.*, ed. R. Cantarella, Naples, 1926, 25 lire. Favourable (A. Severyns). *Theocritus*: Ph. E. Legrand, *Bucol. Grecs I. Theocr.*, Budé, 1925. Apparatus full, if secondhand: comm. interesting (J. Hubaux).

LATIN.—*Anthimus*: N. Groen, *Lexicon Anthimium*, diss. Amsterdam, 1926. Contribution to new dict. of med. Latin (L. Rochus). *Apuleius*: P. Medan, *Metam. XI.*, Hachette, 1925. Very useful (L. Rochus). *Id.*, *La Latinité d'A. dans les Metam.*, 1926. Scientific work of great value: summary (L. R.). *Palladius*: H. Widstrand, *P. Studien*, diss. Uppsala, 1926. Favourable (L. R.). *Plautus*: J. P. Waltzing, *Trinummus and Trad. littéraire*, 1926-7, Champion. Favourable (P. Faider).

GENERAL.—Liddell and Scott, *Greek Lexicon, new ed., Pts. I., II.* A masterpiece of science and of printing (A. Severyns). A. Ernout, *Morphologie hist. du Latin*,<sup>3</sup> Klincksieck, 1927. Perfectly arranged and very suggestive (P. Faider). Ö. Riemann, *Syntaxe latine, revue par A. Ernout*, same publ., 1927. E.'s additions considerable (P. F.). E. Pais, *Hist. romaine I., fasc. 1*, Presses Univ., 1926. Summary: even specialists will be glad of this new synthesis of his many works (L. Halkin).

*Id. XXXI, Nos. 4-9 (APRIL-JULY, 1927).*

H. Glaesener, *Les Sources médiévales du Tasse*. Anon., *Le Jubilé de l'Institut hist. belge à Rome*.

GREEK.—*Homer*: U. v. Wilamowitz, *Die Heimkehr des Odysseus*, 1927. Summary: H. question far from solution if it rests wholly on anything so subjective as appreciation of style (A. Severyns). *Plato*: J. Souilhé, *P. t. XIII. 1 Lettres*, Budé, 1926. Question of authenticity well stated, if not prudently answered (A. Willem). *Sappho*: D. M. Robinson, *S. and her Influence*, Boston, 1924. Enthusiastic encomium (J. Hubaux).

LATIN.—*Cicero*: H. Bornecque and E. Bailly, *Discours t. X. Catil.*, Budé, 1926. Favourable (L. Rochus). *Panegyricus Messalae*: J. Hammer, *Proleg. to an ed. of the P.M. The Career of M. Val. Messala*, New York, 1925. Model diss. (J. Hubaux). *Pelagius*: A. Souter, *Expositions of Thirteen Ep. of St. Paul, I, II*, Cambridge, 1922-6. Definitive (J. de Ghellinck, S.J.). *Virgil*: G. Rohde, *De V. eclogarum forma et indole*, Berlin, 1925. Useful, especially as it insists on unity of tone (J. Hubaux).

GENERAL.—J. Sautel and L. Imbert, *Les Villes romaines de la Vallée du Rhône*, Avignon, Rey, 1926, 20 fr. Well illustrated album (L. Halkin). A. Jardé, *Les Céréales dans l'Antiquité grecque. La Production*, Boccard, 1925. Favourable (R. Scalais). J. P. Waltzing, *Le crime rituel reproché aux Chrétiens du II<sup>e</sup> siècle*,<sup>2</sup> Liège. Favourable (C. L.). [See *Mus. Belge*, Oct., 1925.] A. Delatte, *Les MSS. à Miniatures et à Ornaments des Bibliothèques d'Athènes*, Liège, 1926. Favourable (C. L.). M. Delcourt, *Étude sur les Traductions des Tragiques grecs et latins en France depuis la Renaissance*, Brussels, Lamertin, 1925, 18 fr. Valuable for theories of translation (J. Hubaux). A. Moret, *Le Nil et la civil. Ég. (Évol. de l'Humanité)*, 1926. Sometimes states own views too categorically for this series (F. van de Walle). Favourable anon. notices of P. Jouguet, *L'Impérialisme mac.*, and V. Chapot, *Le Monde romain* (same publ.), and of L. Halphen, *Les Barbares des grandes Invasions aux Conquêtes turques du XI<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, Alcan, 1926, 40 fr. F. Lexa, *La Magie dans l'Égypte antique t. I.-III.*, Geuthner, 1925, 40 fr. suisses.

**PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.**

(JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1927.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte der griechischen Tragödie* [Berlin, 1926, Weidmann. Pp. 270] (Körte). The most valuable research on Greek Tragedy since T. v. Wilamowitz' *Dramatische Technik des Sophokles*. Contains far more than title suggests, including detailed treatment of the whole development of Greek Tragedy.—*Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt. Vol. VII. Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini opera. Pars I.* Comp. J. Leisegang [Berlin, 1926, de Gruyter. Pp. viii + 338] (Stählin). Contains Index nominum, Index locorum

Veteris Testamenti, and Index verborum (to ὡόδης). Reviewer criticises inclusion of Index fontium in Index nominum, and notes that Index verborum only has 'vocabula Philonis philosophiae et theologiae propria.' An Index Graecitatis has yet to be compiled for Philo.—S. Walz, *Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse des Lucian* [Diss. Tübingen, 1921. Pp. 122] (Richtsteig). Thorough piece of work.—B. A. van Groningen, *Hellenisme op vreemde boden* [Inaug. Lecture, Groningen, 1925. Pp. 20] (Kraemer). Reviewer gives very full summary of G.'s lecture, which is chiefly concerned with the Greeks in Egypt. Very instructive, and suggests stimulating problems.—A. J. Trannoy, *Marc-Aurèle, Pensées. Texte établi et traduit. Préface d'Aimé Puech* [Paris, 1925, 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. xxviii+xxvi+148] (Ammon). Text shows penetrating knowledge of subject matter and language; handy critical apparatus. Welcome Index nominum and Index auctorum; but reviewer misses Index rerum memorabilium. Masterly preface by Puech.

LATIN LITERATURE.—L. Castiglioni, *Studi intorno alle 'Storie Filippiche' di Giustino* [Naples, 1925, Rondinelle e Loffredo. Pp. 152] (Klotz). Comprehensive account of grammar and style of Justinus, together with an attempt to estimate more exactly his dependence on Trogus. A valuable contribution; but reviewer misses discussion of J.'s vocabulary.—A. Petersson, *De epitoma Iustini quaestiones criticae* [Uppsala, 1926. Pp. xii+114] (Klotz). Rich store of critical observations on the peculiarities of J.'s language. Valuable contribution both to textual criticism and to history of Latin language.

HISTORY.—E. Hanslik, E. Kohn, E. G. Klaber, and C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Einleitung und Geschichte des alten Orients (Weltgeschichte in gemeinverständlicher Darstellung. Teil I.)* [Gotha-Stuttgart, 1925, Perthes. Pp. xvi+246; one map and one chronological table] (Gustavs). Geographical and prehistorical introductions by Hanslik and Kohn, followed by L.-H.'s history of the ancient East (Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persian empire). Though inevitably sketchy in parts, it misses nothing of importance; full of life and up-to-date.—V. Ehrenberg, *Neugründer des Staates. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Spartas und Athens im 6. Jahrhundert* [München, 1925, Beck. Pp. ix+134] (Lenschau). Deals with (i.) Lycurgus, (ii.) Cleisthenes. Reviewer agrees more completely with the second part than

with the first.—B. Kübler, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts* [Leipzig, 1925, Deichert. Pp. x+459] (Grupe). Will be most welcome both to teachers and to students. Very readable text; notes deal fully with sources and bibliography.—Kromayer-Veith, *Schlachten-atlas zur antiken Kriegsgeschichte. Lieferung 4, Griechische Abteilung. I. Von Marathon bis Chaeroneia* [Leipzig, 1926, Wagner u. Debes. 5 sheets and 38 columns of text], and J. Kromayer, *Antike Schlachtfelder. Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte. Bd. 4, Lieferung 2: I. Perserkriege Teil 5. II. Peloponnesischer Krieg und 4. Jahrhundert* [Berlin, 1926, Weidmann] (Grosse). Monumental work. Research will go ahead and produce new results, but it will have to be founded upon K.-V. as on a 'rocher de bronze.' Fairly long review.—E. v. Dobschütz, *Der Apostel Paulus. I. Seine weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung* [Halle, 1926, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses. Pp. 64 and 21 illustrations] (Posselt). D. has been very successful in drawing a living picture of the great apostle. Long review.

GRAMMAR.—H. C. Nutting, *The Latin Conditional Sentence* [Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1925. Pp. 185] (Klotz). The treatment of impossible conditions is of especial importance.—F. Müller, *Altitalisches Wörterbuch* [Göttingen, 1926, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht. Pp. vii+583] (Stürmer). Indispensable to Comparative and Classical philologists, even if M.'s views cannot everywhere be accepted. A weakness is the arrangement by hypothetical forms, a good feature the attempt to trace the actual history of each Italic word.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—O. Frödin and A. W. Persson, *Rapport préliminaire sur les fouilles d'Asine, 1922-1924* [Leipzig, 1925, Harrassowitz. Pp. 71 and 48 plates] (Karo). Swedish work at Asine represents the highwater-mark of modern archaeological method; a most welcome feature is that publication keeps pace with discovery.

ETHNOLOGY.—A. Byhan, A. Haberlandt, and M. Haberlandt, *Illustrierte Völkerkunde in zwei Bänden. Bd. II. Zweiter Teil: Europa und seine Randgebiete* [Stuttgart, 1926, Strecker u. Schröder. Pp. xxiv+1154; 43 plates and 708 illustrations] (Lehmann). Cannot be too warmly recommended. Contains a wealth of material, often quite unknown, and reversing traditional views about growth of civilisation of European peoples.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

March 11, 1927.

SIRS,

Will you permit me to deny in the *Classical Review* a statement made by the reviewer of my book, *Troy and Paonia*, in your February number? Your reviewer says that I convert Hector 'into a shadowy avatar

of Hades.' This is quite untrue. The whole point of my discussion in the chapter on Trojan Names in the *Iliad* is to show their historical character. I mention the fact noted by others—that there are names in the Trojan royal house that are also the names of chthonian deities, but I do not identify the bearers with those deities. Many people have the names of saints, but that does not make them one with the

saints whose names they bear. I have nowhere suggested that Hector is Hades. The discussion of the names Echelaos-Hektor was continued by me in a paper on the alleged worship of the Trojan Hector in Boeotia. This paper was printed in the *Classical Quarterly*, 1926, 179 f.

I have no wish to enter into a controversy about other views of mine which are the objects of your reviewer's attack. A statement of my position which is absolutely incorrect in point of fact should, I think, be brought to the attention of the same public as that which the review reaches. I may add that your reviewer gives a wrong impression in attributing to me as reprehensible temerity the theory of the connexion of Artemis Basileia, who receives agrarian offerings, and Pheraia, to whom human sacrifice was offered. The identification of Artemis Basileia and Bendis, who had the offering of human sacrifice, has been accepted by many scholars (see, among others, Farnell, *Cults etc.*, IV. 474). And the Bendis-Hekate-Brimo connexion is also generally acknowledged (Farnell, *loc. cit.*, and *Cults etc.*, IV., pp. 507 f.).

There are other points in the summary

denunciation of your reviewer that appear to me inaccurate, but I ask space only to reply to the actually invented view imputed to me.

I am, yours, etc.,

GRACE H. MACURDY,  
Professor of Greek in Vassar  
College.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

In your kindly notice of *Reliquiae A. D. Godley*, May number, pp. 49-50, you question (apparently) A.D.G.'s use of the word *cab* as the translation of ἐπὶνευσιν. The *N.E.D.*, however, gives (sb.): 'A translation clandestinely used by a student in getting up his lessons: a crib.'

I was not quite sure in reading your notice whether you realised that the whole of the English version of these iambs is A.D.G.'s, and not the work of his humble editor.

I remain, Sirs,

Yours faithfully,

May 24, 1927.

C. R. L. FLETCHER.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\* \* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

*Abstracts of dissertations approved for the Ph.D., M.Sc. and M.Litt. degrees in the University of Cambridge for the academical year 1925-1926.* Pp. 73. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Paper.

Adams (C. D.) Demosthenes and his influence. Pp. 184. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap, 1927. Cloth, 5s. net.

Adams (M. A.) The Latinity of the Letters of Saint Ambrose. Pp. xviii + 140. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, vol. xii.) Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1927. Paper.

Allen (J. T.) Stage Antiquities of the Greeks and Romans and their Influence. Pp. xii + 206; 24 illustrations. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927. Cloth, 2s.

Appleton (R. B.) Euripides the Idealist. Pp. xx + 206. London and Toronto: Dent, 1927. Cloth, 6s. net.

Ashby (T.) The Roman Campagna in classical times. Pp. 256, 48 illustrations, map. London: Ernest Benn, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.

Bartoccini (R.) Guida di Lepcis (Leptis Magna). Pp. 125; illustrations. Guida di Sabratha. Pp. 79; illustrations. *Calsa* (G.) Il Teatro Romano di Ostia. Pp. 32; illustrations. Rome: Società Editrice d'Arte Illustrata. Paper, 15, 12, and 4 lire.

Beazley (J. D.) Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Great Britain: Oxford, Ashmolean Museum. Pp. xi + 52; L plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1927. Boards, 18s. net.

Bethe (E.) Die Sage vom troischen Kriege. (Homer / Dichtung und Sage. III. Band.) Pp. vi + 194. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1927. Cloth, 12 R.-M. (unbound, 10 R.-M.).

Bonner (R. J.) Lawyers and litigants in ancient Athens. Pp. xi + 276. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927. Cloth.

Bornecque (H.) and Rabaud (G.) Cicéron. Discours. Tome V. Seconde action contre Verres. Livre IV. Texte établi par H. B. et traduit par G. R. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Paper.

Bréhier (E.) Histoire de la Philosophie. Tome I: L'Antiquité et le Moyen Age. II: Période hellénistique et romaine. Pp. 261-525. Paris: Alcan, 1927. Paper, 18 fr.

Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé. No. 15. Avril, 1927; No. 16, Juillet, 1927.

Burckhardt (G.) Die Akteinteilung in der neuen griechischen und in der römischen Komödie. Pp. 60. Basel: Basler Druck- und Verlags-Anstalt, 1927. Paper.

Burger (C. P.) 'Aere perennius.' Scherts en Ernst in de Oden van Horatius. Pp. xii + 336. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1926. Paper, 3 fl.

Calhoun (G. M.) The growth of criminal law in ancient Greece. Pp. x + 149. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1927. Cloth, 15s. net.

Catalogue des Manuscrits Alchimiques Grecs. II. Les manuscrits italiens, décrits par C. O. Zuretti. Pp. vi + 369. Brussels: Lamertin, 1927. Paper.

- Chantraine* (P.) *Histoire du parfait grec*. Pp. x+266. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société Linguistique de Paris — XXI.) Paris: Champion, 1927. Paper.
- Classical Philology*. Vol. XXII, No. 2. April 1927.
- Collart* (P.) *Les papyrus Bouriant*. Pp. 254. Paris: Champion, 1926. Paper, 160 fr.
- Conley* (C. H.) *The first English translators of the classics*. Pp. 158. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1927. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.
- Ducati* (P.) and *Giglioli* (G. Q.) *Arte Etrusca*. Pp. 103; 91 plates. Rome: Società Editrice d'Arte Illustrata. Paper, 80 lire.
- Farrington* (B.) *Primum Graius Homo*. An anthology of Latin translations from the Greek from Ennius to Livy, with an introductory essay and running commentary. Pp. 64. Cambridge: University Press. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Fraser* (J.) *Linguistic evidence and archaeological and ethnographical facts*. Pp. 18. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy.) London: Milford, 1927. Paper, 2s. net.
- Frisk* (H.) *Le Périple de la Mer Erythrée*. Suivi d'une étude sur la tradition et la langue. Pp. viii+145. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXIII. 1927: 1.) Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber. Paper, 8 kr.
- Glover* (T. R.) *Democracy in the ancient world*. Pp. ix+263. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Greek Printing Types, 1465-1927*. Facsimiles from an exhibition of books illustrating the development of Greek printing shown in the British Museum, 1927. With an historical introduction by V. Scholderer. Pp. 21; 62 facsimiles. London: sold at the Museum and by B. Quaritch and H. Milford, 1927. Boards, 21s. net.
- Harrison* (J. E.) *Themis: a study of the social origins of Greek religion*. Second edition, revised, with preface and supplementary notes. Pp. xxxvi+559. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Haskins* (C. H.) *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. Pp. xi+437. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Herrmann* (L.) *Sénèque: Tragédies, Tome II: Oedipe, Agamemnon, Thyeste, Hercule sur l'Oeta*. Pseudo-Sénèque: Octavie. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926. Paper.
- Hirt* (H.) *Indogermanische Grammatik, Teil III: Das Nomen*. Pp. xi+360. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 13<sup>a</sup>.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1927. Paper, 14.50 M. (bound, 16.50 M.)
- Horace up to date*. Pp. vii+183. London: A. and C. Black. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Hunt* (A. S.) *B. P. Grenfell, 1869-1926*. Pp. 8. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy.) London: Milford. Paper, 1s. net.
- Hunter* (L. W.) *Aeneas on Siegcraft*. A critical edition prepared by L. W. H.; revised, with some additions, by S. A. Handford. Pp. lxxxiv+266. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Immisch* (O.) *Gorgiae Helena*. Pp. 55. (Kleine Texte, 158.) Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1927. 3 M.
- Kean* (M.) *Livy, Book II, Chapters 27-47*. Pp. xiv+105. (Bell's Illustrated Classics.) London: G. Bell, 1927. Cloth, 2s.
- Kermack* (W. R.) *Human environment and progress*. The outline of world historical geography. Pp. viii+232; 52 maps and illustrations. Edinburgh and London: W. and A. K. Johnston, 1927. Cloth, 4s.
- Lawlor* (H. J.) and *Oulton* (J. E. L.) *Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*. Translated, with introduction and notes. Pp. xvi+402. London: S.P.C.K., 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Legrand* (Ph. E.) *Bucoliques Grecs. Tome II: Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, divers*. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Paper.
- Levi* (A.) *Il concetto del tempo nei suoi rapporti coi problemi del divenire e dell'essere nella filosofia di Platone*. Saggio sulla teoria delle idee. Pp. 112. Turin etc.: Paravia. Paper, 6 L.
- Levi* (A.) *Sulle interpretazione immanentistiche della filosofia di Platone*. Pp. vii+242. Turin etc.: Paravia. Paper.
- Ljungvik* (H.) *Studien zur Sprache der apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*. Pp. xi+106. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1926. Filosofi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper. 8.) Uppsala: Lundequist. Paper, 4 kr.
- Marsh* (F. B.) *The Founding of the Roman Empire*. 2nd edition. Pp. xix+313. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- [*Mattingly* (H.)] *A Guide to the Exhibition of Roman Coins in the British Museum*. Pp. 80, 8 Plates and 11 Figures. London: by order of the Trustees, 1927. 2s. net.
- McGuire* (M. R. P.) *S. Ambrosii de Nabuthae*. A commentary, with an introduction and translation. Pp. xix+251. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XV.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1927. Paper.
- McWilliam* (O. G. E.) *Virgil, Aeneid II, in English and Latin*. Pp. xi+121. (Elementary Classics.) London: Macmillan, 1927. Cloth, 2s.
- Monetio*. Rivista di Antichità. Anno III. Fascicolo IV. 1927.
- Mueller* (P. J. H.) *De veterum grammaticorum in Terentio studiis criticis*. Pp. x+100. Aquisgrani: ex Typ. 'Buco.' 1926.
- Neue Wege zur Antike*, IV. Tacitus und sein Werk, von R. Reitzenstein. Sallust als Historiker, Politiker und Tendenzschriftsteller, von W. A. Baehrens. Germanenkämpfe in der römischen Kunst, von F. Koepf. Die Grundlagen und Voraussetzungen der römischen Revolution, von U. Kahrstedt. Pp. 118. Leipzig: Teubner. Paper, 5 R.-M.

- Nilsson* (M. P.) The Minoan-Mycenaean religion and its survival in Greek religion. Pp. xxiii + 582; IV plates, 113 figures. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund. IX.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1927. Cloth, 31s. 6d.
- Nixon* (P.) Martial and the Modern Epigram. Pp. vii + 208. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome, 18.) New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Opuscula Philologa* herausgegeben vom Kath. Akad. Philologenverein in Wien im Sommersemester 1927. 2. Jahrgang. Pp. 45. Linz: Akad. Pressvereinsdruckerei, 1927. Paper.
- Parsons* (C. A.) and *Little* (C. E.) First Latin Lessons for Junior and Senior High Schools. Pp. xx + 308; illustrations. Boston, etc.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1926. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Paul-Louis*. Ancient Rome at Work. An economic history of Rome from the origins to the Empire. Pp. xiv + 347; 4 plates, 6 maps. (The History of Civilization.) London: Kegan Paul, 1927. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Perret* (J.-L.) La transmission du texte de Juvénal d'après une nouvelle collation. Pp. 100. Helsingfors: Akademiska Bokhandeln, 1927. Paper, 40 Finnish marks.
- Pickard - Cambridge* (A. W.) Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy. Pp. xvi + 435; 49 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Ramsay* (Sir W. M.) Asianic Elements in Greek Civilisation. Pp. xi + 303; illustrations. London: Murray, 1927. Cloth, 12s. net.
- Robertson* (J. C.), *Bennett* (J. S.) and *Glassey* (D. A.) Selections from Virgil, with introduction, notes and vocabulary. Pp. vi + 231. London: Harrap, 1927. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Robinson* (E. S. G.) Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyrenaica. (British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins.) Pp. cclxxv + 154; 47 Plates. London: by order of the Trustees (Oxford University Press), 1927. 40s.
- Rogers* (H. L.) and *Harley* (T. R.) The Life of Rome. Illustrative passages from Latin literature selected and translated. Pp. xii + 264; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Rollfuss* (C.) Des Qu. Horatius Flaccus Carmina in ihrem kunstvollen Strophenaufbau herausgegeben. Pp. xvi + 117. Oldenburg i. O.: Schulztesche Hofbuchdruckerei, 1927. 3.50 R.-M.
- Ross* (W. D.) The Works of Aristotle, translated into English under the editorship of W.D.R. Vol. VII. Problemata, by E. S. Forster. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Rostagni* (A.) La Poetica di Aristotele con introduzione, commento e appendice critica. Pp. xcvi + 147. Turin: Chiantore, 1927. Paper, 25 L.
- Rostovtzeff* (M.) A history of the ancient world. Vol. II. Rome. Translated from the Russian by J. D. Duff. Pp. xv + 387; xcvi plates, 12 figures, 2 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Scott* (I. G.) The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal. Pp. 118. (Smith College Classical Studies, no. 8, May, 1927.) Northampton, Massachusetts. Paper.
- Séchan* (L.) Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique. Pp. viii + 642; 161 illustrations. Paris: Champion, 1926. Paper.
- Souter* (A.) The earliest Latin commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul. A study. Pp. x + 244. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Spiegelberg* (W.) The credibility of Herodotus' account of Egypt. With a few additional notes by the translator, A. M. Blackman. Pp. 40. Oxford: Blackwell, 1927. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Svoboda* (K.) L'Esthétique d'Aristote. Pp. 212. (Opera Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Masarykianae Brunensis.) Brno, 1927. Paper. (On sale at 'Les Belles Lettres,' Paris.)
- The American Journal of Philology*. Vol. XLVIII, 1. Whole No. 189. Jan., Feb., March, 1927; 2. Whole No. 190. April, May, June, 1927.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by J. B. Bury, etc. Vol. VI. Macedon, 401-301 B.C. Pp. xxii + 648. Volume of plates I, prepared by C. T. Seltman. Pp. xxviii + 395. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Cloth, 30s. and 25s. net.
- Theodorakopoulos* (J.) Platons Dialektik des Seins. Pp. 96. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927. M. 4.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. Vol. LXVII. 1926.
- Waddell* (H.) The Wandering Scholars. Pp. xxviii + 292; illustrations. London: Constable, 1927. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Walker* (R. J.) Les Catalogues Varroniens. Pp. 109. Paris: G. Ficker, 1927. Paper.
- Walston* (Sir C.) Notes on Greek Sculpture. Pp. vii + 23; 26 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. Boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Waltz* (R.) Sénèque: Dialogues, Tome IV. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1927. Paper.
- Walzel* (O.) Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Lieferung 65. Kappelmacher, Römische Literatur, Heft 2. Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion. Paper, 1 R.-M.
- Way* (A. C.) The language and style of the Letters of St. Basil. Pp. xv + 230. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XIII.) Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1927. Paper.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf* (U. von) Aristophanes Lysistrate. Pp. 223. Berlin: Weidmann, 1927. Paper, 9 M.
- Witte* (K.) Die Geschichte der römischen Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus. Erster Teil: Vergil. Zweiter Band: Vergils Georgica. Pp. iii + 180. Erlangen: Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1927. Paper, 14 M.
- Wohleb* (E.) Antike Metrik für den Schulgebrauch. Erstes Heft: Griechische Metrik, von F. Eckstein. Pp. 37. Zweites Heft: Römische Metrik, von P. Fleig und E. W. Pp. 24. Bielefeld und Leipzig: Velhagen und Klasing, 1926.

n,  
ue  
p.  
n,  
es  
'p.  
7.  
us'  
ual  
n.  
er,  
p.  
ni-  
no,  
s,  
ol.  
b.,  
ay,  
by  
101  
1,  
95.  
th,  
ies  
. 4.  
can  
26.  
Pp.  
on-  
ns.  
r.  
ure.  
ge:  
net.  
IV.  
/ni-  
lles  
sen-  
Rö-  
ots-  
the-  
the  
The  
istic  
The  
per.  
sto-  
eid-  
chen.  
ster  
gils  
bst-  
M.  
hul-  
trik,  
left :  
W.  
und